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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Mark This Name

There are many reasons to know who Richard Stonley is.¹ As a teller of the exchequer during the reigns of Mary and Elizabeth Tudor, Stonley played an important part in the history of Tudor finance. An associate of the Petre family, land dealer to Lord Burghley, and intimate of London’s ruling elite, he fit squarely within the upper links of that Great Chain of Being, which ordered so much of early modern society. His perch in Westminster Hall and the connections that brought him there further illustrate his lofty status. Stonley was not only one of Tudor London’s elite, however; he also became a debtor to Elizabeth I. The occasion of his impecuniosity comes, as Leslie Hotson writes, with “added spice,” since Stonley’s debt sprang from his embezzlement of over £12,000 from Her Majesty’s treasury.² Stonley eventually found himself renting a room at Fleet Street Prison while working to balance his accounts. But these are not the only reasons to know his name.

¹ Early modern orthography (i.e. spelling) is notoriously variable. Other renditions of this Elizabethan teller’s surname name include “Stonly,” “Stoneley,” and “Stonely.” Unsurprisingly he spelled his own name differently at different times. One can compare, for example, Stonley’s autograph signature on the title page of Glasgow University’s copy of Thomas Elyot’s Castel of Helth, which appears as “Richard Stonley,” (Special Collection Hunterian Au.4.11a) and his record of law charges “for a scire facias agenst Ricard Stonly” (Folger MS V.a. 460 65ª; hereafter Folger 460 65ª). (Jason Scott-Warren’s research offers the foundation for the former citation.) While N. M. Fuide and others have opted to render the exteller’s surname “Stoneley,” I have chosen to call him “Stonley” as most tend to do.

Stonley has other claims to fame. One is a short bill recorded into a sixteenth-century journal. Under the heading for June 12, 1593, Elizabeth’s embezzling teller noted his purchase of “the survey of France with the Venus and Adhonay per Shakspere.” The bill renders him the first known buyer of William Shakespeare’s printed work. Following the rediscovery of this short note in the early 1970s, G. B. Hardison, Jr., the director of the Folger Shakespeare Library, said that the receipt was “one of the most important Shakespeare finds of the last decade.” Shakespeare Quarterly editor James G. McManaway called it “sensational.” His connection to the Bard notwithstanding, Stonley is an interesting figure in other ways.

Stonley’s incarceration by the queen was a boon for bibliophiles and historians of material life, as the efforts of the Crown to recoup its losses produced an extensive inventory of Stonley’s possessions. This inventory includes over four hundred books and pamphlets, spanning works on witchcraft, Turkish history, and bodily health along with numerous Bibles and other religious titles. Most of these texts were in English. Stonley’s books appear sporadically alongside a variety of objects—a bone candlestick, a “Turkie Carpet,” and a “Wallnuttree Chaire and cusshen,” among others. Leslie Hotson has presented a short overview of Stonley’s background with a “purified” inventory of his books in her mid-century article for Studies in Bibliography. This work sheds some light

---

3 Folger 460 9'.
5 One can find this quotation in a number of news articles from early 1973, including for example: Judith Cummings, “Shakespeare Diary Given,” Corpus Christi Caller (6 May 1973), C1.
7 TNA E 159/412/435.
8 See Hotson, 49-63. An expanded record of Stonley’s inventory is also available via the Folger’s Private Libraries in Renaissance England website (http://plre.folger.edu/). My thanks to Michael Graham for this
on the teller and his library, yet much about this figure and his work still remains in the dark.

Other scholars have briefly considered Stonley’s journals. Though he probably composed dozens of them—as well as a variety of other records—only three have survived. He wrote these between 1581 and 1598, and they now reside at the Folger Shakespeare Library. Prior to arriving there, the spotty provenance of these texts is replete with question marks, which a later chapter will ponder. These works and other records of Stonley’s life have been cited in studies of early modern print culture, the history of reading, Tudor parliament and politics, religious mentalities, manuscripts, literature, and the social history of London, among others. In these writings, however, Stonley’s journals have garnered few substantial remarks. His inclusion in some studies over the last three decades owes something to the work of Christopher Coleman. The

citation. Jason Scott-Warren has also identified a number of additional books owned by Stonley (and his wife, Anne). See his forthcoming book.

fruit of Coleman’s investigation into Stonley’s life and service to the Tudor queens has spread by word of mouth to some, but it has never seen publication.\textsuperscript{10} Despite his limited appearance in print, both the Tudor teller and his journals have failed to become objects of sustained inquiry in their own right. Given the many reasons to develop an interest in this figure and his work, their neglect is astonishing. This thesis capitalizes on that deficit.

The exception to the rule has been the recent work of Jason Scott-Warren, whose 2010 article in John King’s \textit{Tudor Books and Readers: Materiality and the Construction of Meaning} focuses on Stonley’s journals and inventories, viewing them as exercises in the construction of cultural and social capital. These texts participated in a “pan-European culture of appraisal,” in which the subjective and the objective, the mental and the material aspects of Stonley’s world converged into a single valuating account. Stonley’s journals are therefore “an accountant’s fictions, a means for securing creditworthiness in the wider community.”\textsuperscript{11} This thesis is deeply indebted to Scott-Warren’s argument and his continuing research into Richard Stonley, and it seeks to build on this foundation by devoting further attention to the spatial, material, and serial aspects of Stonley’s reading and writing in his three surviving journals.

By analyzing these activities in thick description, this thesis performs what might be termed an anthropology of a manuscript.\textsuperscript{12} It approaches Stonley’s writings as serial


\textsuperscript{12} A manuscript is “a book, document, etc., written by hand.” Such a definition can get complicated, of course, when handwriting and print are found in the same texts. No such mixing appears in Stonley’s writings however. OED s.v. “manuscript.”
texts that shared in the mental, physical, cultural, and social life of their primary author. From this viewpoint, I argue that though it is appropriate to envision Stonley’s journals within a culture of appraisal, as Scott-Warren has suggested, these journals were not simple exercises in credit construction. Moreover, Scott-Warren’s claim that Stonley’s “diaristic” entries possess an “ideal form” elides subtle yet important changes in their language, meaning, and function over the course of the writings. Overall, Stonley’s journals harbor many aims and connotations. The selves contained in these journals transform by degrees, even while Stonley’s concern with his own textual reputation remained relatively constant. As Stonley’s concern with reputation persisted, it complemented and contended with other concerns—sometimes haphazard and inexplicable ones—which superseded the former at times. The friction and flow of the various uses and images of the three surviving journals of Richard Stonley is a central focus of this thesis.

So too are the physical aspects of the text. This thick description of a sixteenth-century Londoner’s journals incorporates a discussion of how the spaces and materials involved in Stonley’s serial writing influence the order and meaning of his texts. It reveals that the putatively “ideal” structure of Stonley’s earliest journal entries is undermined by the teller’s habits of composition, as evinced by the relation of his movements through London and the surrounding areas to the ink patterns in his journals.

---

13 I discuss the form of Stonley’s “diaristic” entries and their relation to the other parts of his journals in chapter three. For now, it is sufficient to acknowledge that Jason Scott-Warren has made a useful point in arguing that Stonley’s “daily diary entries have an ideal form,” which involved “countless elaborations.” His insistence on the importance of considering these formulaic “diaristic” entries as part of a “composite form” that the writings exhibit is also well taken (“Books,” 246, 247). Still, though Scott-Warren emphasizes the role of this composite form in the construction of Stonley’s creditable image, I emphasize how this form changed over time and how it served additional needs beyond that of credit creation.
The knowledge of Stonley’s physical location also complicates the meaning of static words and phrases in these writings. This thesis affirms that material implements and spaces of composition add other dimensions to the exegesis of any given manuscript.

At its essence, then, this microscopic view of Richard Stonley’s journals considers how the life of three manuscript writings coincided with that of their primary author and extended beyond him. That kind of view insists that serial manuscripts contain multiple layers of meaning that are subject to change under the conditions of their production and transmission. It also sheds a great deal more light on a vastly understudied individual and his writings. More than this, it responds to a need for increased scholarly vigilance concerning the ways that early modern English manuscripts were formed, how they functioned, and what they meant within their earliest contexts.

Recent Trends in Early Modern Scholarship

The anthropology of a manuscript that the present lines contain interacts with a number of recent trends in early modern scholarship. The term itself is inspired by another of Jason Scott-Warren’s works. Responding to William Sherman’s concern for viewing early modern “graffiti” as a salient aspect of the history of books and readers, Scott-Warren has argued for the need to treat marks in books “not merely as evidence of reading but also and more broadly as part of what we might call the anthropology of the book. Such an anthropology would aspire to reconstruct the place of the book in the changing textures of personal, social, and material life, showing how books found their

---

14 Throughout this thesis, “early modern” denotes a period in history that roughly spans the late-fifteenth and early-eighteenth centuries. Admittedly, this is a weighted term. I use it despite its problematic association with the discourse of “modernity” and its evocation of a coherent, self-contained era because it offers a convenient shorthand for a rough period of time.
place in the fashioning of individual identities, in the negotiation of relationships, and in encounters with the world of things.”

Such a view is integral to the history of the book as we know it today, and it has much to offer that might enhance our understanding of early modern British culture and society. This same conceptual framework can and should be extended to manuscripts as well as printed texts.

In recent decades, a growing number of scholars have come to treat manuscript writings as complex cultural artifacts that involved a much broader collection of writers, readers, and listeners than had previously been acknowledged. Harold Love’s *Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England* has revealed how, among elite audiences, scribal literature relied upon a variety of hands for production and dissemination. Scribal communities handled these works and passed them on to further readership circles. Accordingly, these writings “had a role in the culture and commerce of texts just as assured as that of print publication”—a role that decreased as “script values” found their way into printed form during the eighteenth century.

Manuscript letters have undergone a similar reassessment. Riding the recent wave of material studies, James Daybell’s *Material Letter in Early Modern England* has considered how the material aspects of early modern missives unlock their latent meanings. This materiality involves not simply the ink and paper of a manuscript letter,

---

but also the social conditions and contexts in which it was created and disseminated. The use of space, the quality of the paper, the slant of the writing, the spelling of the words, and conventions of the text each played a role in the signification process. As a result, Daybell has characterized letter writing as a “complex (often collaborative rather than solitary) activity”—one that also regularly involved “layers of secretarial input,” passage through multiple hands, and transmission into and through a variety of secondary textual mediums.  

“Self-writings” and their associates have garnered a fresh look as well. Adam Smyth’s rich study of life-writing in almanacs, financial records, commonplace books, and parish registers is one of many recent works probing the complex nature of early modern autobiographies. Smyth’s scholarship reveals how self-writings were often linked within a chain of texts (penned by a single hand or many) and were incidental to other “conventional” kinds of writings. In an article that supplements his revisionary rendering of Godly reading as a communal exercise, Andrew Cambers has shown how Puritan self-writings often anticipated additional readers according to their marginalia and content. In doing so he adds further weight to the claim that the “rigid distinction” between manuscript self-writings as unadulterated, private documents and printed works

---


as contrived for public audience is “unte
enable.” When considering Anne Clifford’s
diary writing habits, Aaron Kunin has recognized the role of servants as “facilitators”
within the composition process. This slew of studies converges across disciplinary
boundaries to reveal the importance of interrogating the manuscript and its social import.
This burgeoning area of study has further to go. Alan Stewart’s 2002 claim that “beyond
the recent work on commercial play-writing, there is a distinctive dearth of scholarship
on the writing process in the early modern period” still has some bite. Material studies
and other fields are reducing the dearth of scholarship on the writing process, and this
thesis supplements that work by discussing the ways and means of Stonley’s writing.

Closely related to the study of manuscript culture is the study of books and their
readers. Here is a second major field that frames this thesis. Since the linguistic and
cultural turns of the 1960s and 70s, the research of books and readers has shifted. Kevin
Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker have noted how developments in linguistic theory have
discredited “simply positivist notions of meaning, intention, and authorship,” which
suffused the study of books prior to the 1980s. As a result, scholars are now advised not
to rely on the assurance that a given book has succeeded in guiding its rebellious readers
to a clear vision of a text’s meaning. As Roland Barthes has famously argued, “a text’s
unity lies not in its origin but in its destination,” which has no singular provenance. This
approach, founded in literary criticism, has combined with other trends to bolster

21 Aaron Kunin, “From the Desk of Anne Clifford,” English Literary History 71.3 (Fall 2004), 587.
22 See Alan Stewart, “The Making of Writing in Renaissance England: Rethinking Authorship through
Collaboration,” Renaissance Transformations: The Making of English Writing (1500 – 1650), eds. Margaret
Healy and Thomas Healy (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009), 84.
23 Kevin Sharpe and Steven N. Zwicker, “Introduction: Discovering the Renaissance Reader,” in Reading,
24 Roland Barthes, “The Death of the Author,” in Image-Music-Text, ed. and trans by Stephen Heath,
scholarship of the history of reading. Sharpe and Zwicker have asserted that the new social history’s revisionist approach to authority, which rendered it “not centered and fixed but dispersed and uncertain, contingent and contestable,” has imputed greater significance to those who were previously too “ordinary” to draw sustained interest—enter historical readers and their texts.25 They have also discussed the new bibliography’s attention to the planned and unplanned divergence of texts from authorial intention during the text-making process. Throughout the history of print, this process involved a variety of collaborators—“authors, publishers, licensers, printers, typesetters, proofreaders, booksellers.”26 If each of these individuals helps to establish the “order” of the text, so too does the reader—that “poacher” of the written word—whose interpretive sphere compels his or her re-inscription of that order, over and over again.27

Several scholars have channeled the momentum offered via the fields of literary criticism, social history, and bibliography into studies that have enhanced our understanding of early modern reading. Anthony Grafton, among others, has discussed how humanists conversed with the classics during the Renaissance.28 His work shows

25 Sharpe and Zwicker, 2.
26 Ibid., 2.
that men like Leone Battista Alberti, Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, Guillaume Budé, and Johannes Kepler did not engage in a “single, narrowly-defined way of reading” but read the ancients with multiple “pragmatic” purposes in mind.  

Kepler studied the classics “as a scientist collecting data, a historian reconstructing the past, a political adviser looking for pragmatic guidance, and a rhetorician forming an elegant style.”

While Richard Stonley was no Gabriel Harvey, his journals do contain classical content in the form of proverbs, and Grafton’s vision of pragmatic reading offers a foundation for exploring these notes.

Yet Grafton’s is not the only voice that informs this study, and pragmatism is not the only impulse that directed Stonley’s reading. Using Brayman Hackel’s overview of the “great variety” of approaches to reading material in early modern England as a basis, Fred Schurink has offered a helpful corrective to Grafton’s emphasis on the elite, pragmatic model.  

His recent article reviews the reading styles of three compilers of texts, each of whom fail to appear as solely “pragmatic” readers, studying for action, or “recreational” readers, savoring the language. Schurink’s subjects intermixed different kinds of works in their commonplace books, revealing “an intriguing combination of a utilitarian moral approach to literature and a more recreational and everyday interest in the quoted works.”

This thesis tests the merit of Schurink’s approach in a later chapter.

---

29 Grafton, Commerce with the Classics, 225.
30 Ibid., 225.
32 Fred Schurink, “Manuscript Commonplace Books, Literature, and Reading in Early Modern England,” Huntington Library Quarterly 73.3 (September 2010), 469.
While Grafton and company have revealed the pragmatic scope of humanist reading in Renaissance Europe and Schurink and Hackel have shown additional, haphazard motives for reading in early modern England, Kevin Sharpe has emphasized the need to consider how meanings arise from reader to reader and reading to reading.\(^{33}\) His study of Sir William Drake—a pragmatic reader \textit{par excellence}—employs interdisciplinary scholarship to chart a revolution in Drake’s exegesis over the course of the Civil War. Sharpe’s tactful approach to theory and his interest in the fluidity of meaning offer a foundation for what follows.

To a lesser extent, this work finds its roots within a third field as well—one that has witnessed extraordinary growth in the recent years. This field encompasses the study of early modern London. Early modern London has gained much via its encounter with the spatial turn, which has involved an increasing attention to the effects and meanings of space, place, and movement in the lives of individuals. Vanessa Harding has written that “an awareness of the importance of space, and of the physical fabric of the city, to its inhabitants seems now to be well ingrained. All the recent collections of essays on early modern London contain the word space in one or more of their chapter headings or divisions.”\(^{34}\) So too with this study. When appropriate, it draws a connection between Stonley’s texts and locations in and around London. It considers the effect and meaning of London’s spaces for the Tudor teller’s reading and writing habits, and it reveals some ways that Stonley’s physical location influenced the construction of meaning found within his texts.


\(^{34}\) Vanessa Harding, “Recent Perspectives on Early Modern London,” \textit{The Historical Journal} 47.2 (June 2004), 444.
This work stands to offer an anthropology of a manuscript that appears at the crossroads of three fields. Its sensitivity to the materials and processes of composition and the cultural and social significances of handwritten texts is conditioned by recent studies of scribes and manuscripts. Its emphasis on the mutability of meaning and the shifting and contingent qualities of Stonley’s journals is informed by the new history of books and their readers. Its application of spatial context to the form, function, and meaning of these works finds its foundation in the spatial turn as applied to the study of early modern London. Poised on these platforms, this thesis provides a new and nuanced perspective of a much-overlooked set of documents and a writer of remarkable interest.

Digression on a Term

Before advancing to the body of the work, a brief digression on a term is necessary. I have chosen to call the writings of Richard Stonley “journals” for a number of reasons, though some have designated them “diaries.” Stonley used these writings partly as a medium for transmitting financial information from one account to another. This was a common exercise during his time. Even while Ceri Sullivan has noted that “no exact practice of accounting had emerged” in sixteenth-century England, there were a variety of handbooks that outlined a basic system of financial bookkeeping. James Peele’s *Pathe Waye to Perfectnes, in th’Accomptes of Debitor, and Creditour* was one of these. In this work, Peele discussed three books used for organizing financial accounts. The first—termed a memorial—captured all the transactions of a given household near

35 See Guy, 394; Raymond, 4n1; Scott-Warren, “Books,” 237; Haigh, 686; Ian Warren, 56.
the time of their occurrence. The second, “being called the Journall, whiche is to saie the
daylie book,” channeled these transactions into a book used by the master himself.37
Peele referred to the final book as the leger, or “boke of accomptes,” which provided a
further, finely-tuned matrix of organizing debits and credits.38 Stonley owned Peele’s
work and his writings exhibit many characteristics of the “Journall” it described.39 In
addition to denoting a very specific type of early modern account book, though, the
journal had broader connotations in early modern England as a “book or record.”40 This
meaning applies to Stonley’s works as well. Therefore, “journal” is a good label for the
teller’s writings.

At first glance, this distinction may seem pedantic, especially when Tom Webster
has warned against placing “rigid generic boundaries” around examples of self-writing
(or “egoliteratures” in his parlance)—separating “autobiography” from “conversion
narrative” from “spiritual journal” in a context that that perceived no such neat
categorization.41 Though I call Stonley’s works journals, I recognize that this word also
fails to fully contain these texts, which incorporate reading notes, tallies of plague
victims, records of meals and dinner guests, gifts given and received and much more.
Stonley’s compositions, like so many from this time period, were fluid and contingent
artifacts of life, which often privileged utility and convenience over order and uniformity.

38 Ibid., 9v.
39 Stonley’s ownership of Peele’s *Pathe Way* (among other books for accountants) is noted in the Folger’s
*Private Libraries of the Renaissance*, among other places.
40 *OED*, s.v. “Journal.”
41 Tom Webster, “Writing to Redundancy: Approaches to Spiritual Journals and Early Modern Spirituality,”
Nevertheless, these works need a descriptor if only for convenience’s sake. Arguably, “journal” is the most apt.

There is a second reason that I favor “journal.” While “diary” in its early modern usage was not necessary associated with writings that exhibited a focus on narrative, interiority, and the development of the self, it has since come to connote a genre of writing that does.42 I hope that ditching “diary” will help to diminish the unconscious impulse to read Stonley’s writings as works that look no further than the individual.43 Whatever selves emerge from Stonley’s works are ancillary to other conventional aims that these writings served. Meredith Anne Skura has asserted that, since it “was not particularly interesting or appropriate to talk about ‘inwardness’ or the ‘development of personality’” in sixteenth-century England, few writers attempted to do so.44 Stonley was no different.

Though Richard Stonley shied away from making himself into a true focal point, that self continues to appear in his reading notes, purchases, and a variety of other idiosyncratic additions to these works. That self is visible, even if it was not premised as the main attraction. Therefore, even while this thesis denies that Stonley used his journals as self-narratives, it recognizes that the self is everywhere discoverable within them. This observation leads to another crucial point. Stonley’s works evince a certain level of

42 _OED_ s.v. “diary.”
43 What, then, might be said of the late-Tudor Puritan diaries of Richard Rogers, for example? Even these, while clearly displaying a fervent interiority, were nevertheless unconcerned with the “development of the self.” See Webster, “Writing to Redundancy.” And even these, like other Puritan diaries, followed conventions and allegories and were implicated in community building. This is a long way from the “pure and unadulterated” texts that later writers aspired to create. See Cambers, “Reading, the Godly, and Self-Writing in England.” For a distillation of Rogers’s diaries, see M.M. Knappen, ed., _Two Elizabethan Puritan Diaries_ (Chicago: 1933).
44 Skura, 2.
subjectivity. His subjectivity does not simply inhabit the words that he chose to describe himself. It suffuses the objects and activities he recorded as well.\footnote{While “accumulated things” were surely a primary form of subjectivity in early modern England, as Adam Smyth has argued, Jason Scott-Warren has also made the observation that the “technologies and languages for representing the self” (i.e. “portraits and self-portraits, sonnets and lyrics, diaries and journals, biographies and proto-autobiographies, dramatic soliloquies”) were rapidly developing within this increasingly text-saturated era. See Smyth, Autobiography, 11; Jason Scott-Warren, Early Modern English Literature (Malden, MA: Polity, 2005), 223-246.} Scholars often seem to forget that willful subjectivity exists beyond narrative introspection—a medium that, as I have suggested, few favored during this period. Stonley’s subjectivity manifested itself in his clamor for fustian doublets, his collection of books, and his participation in gift exchanges as well as in his personal pronouns. In this way, those infamous words of Jacob Burckhardt are again disputed.\footnote{“In the Middle Ages both sides of human consciousness – that which was turned within as that which was turned without – lay dreaming or half awake beneath a common veil. The veil was woven of faith, illusion and childish prepossession, through which the world and history were seen clad in strange hues. Man was conscious of himself only as a member of a race, people, party, family or corporation – only through some general category. In Italy this veil first melted into air; an objective treatment and consideration of the state and of all the things of this world became possible. The subjective side at the same time asserted itself with corresponding emphasis; man became a spiritual individual, and recognized himself as such.” Jacob Burckhardt, The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy, trans. S. G.C. Middlemore (1860; reprint, New York: Penguin, 1990), 98.} In final analysis, these varied observations amount to a defense of self and subjectivity in a work that privileged neither in explicit terms. Because it did not and because it acted as a journal in two senses of the word, I have described the writings of Richard Stonley as journals.

The Order of the Text

The body of this thesis is divided into five chapters. In an effort to situate Stonley’s journals within the context of his life and work, the next chapter offers a brief biography. Chapter three analyzes how the purposes of his three extant texts influence our image of their author. It proceeds in chronological order, comparing and contrasting Stonley’s three surviving journals, which he kept from June 1581—December 1582, May
1593—May 1594, and February 1597—May 1598. This chapter argues that Stonley used his writings in different ways over time and that these different uses precipitate shifting images of the teller. Chapter four considers Stonley’s reading habits. It acknowledges that his textual notations occupy “liminal” spaces within his journals. They also show how Stonley engaged in a variety of readings. Chapter five considers how the material aspects of the Tudor teller’s journals tell a story of their own—one that enriches any understanding of the information presented in therein. The final chapter of this thesis provides a brief overview of the study itself. It reviews how the preceding levels of analysis refute any understanding of Stonley’s journals as texts of singular use, form, reading, and writing. These writings are suffused with changing “textures of personal, social, and material life.” Herein lies the anthropology of a manuscript.
CHAPTER II
THE LIFE AND TIMES OF RICHARD STONLEY, TELLER OF THE EXCHEQUER

Early Life, Associations, and the Exchequer

Richard Stonley was born about 1520, but the details of his early life are murky.47 N. M. Fuidge has speculated that his family may have originated in Stoneley (now Stoneleigh), Warwickshire, near one of his former estates, but this claim remains unsubstantiated.48 Stonley becomes more visible in the historical record with the rise of Mary Tudor to the English throne. The calendar of patent roles for Philip and Mary indicates that he was appointed one of the four tellers of the Exchequer of Receipt in 1554. This office empowered him to receive the queen’s money and act as her payment agent while enjoying the “wages, fees, robes, and emoluments” thereof.49

Stonley may have gotten married about the time of his appointment to the exchequer, or shortly thereafter. His bride was Anne, the daughter of John Braunche and Joan Wilkenson. Anne’s brothers, Sir John and Thomas Braunche, were prominent members of the Drapers’ Company in London.50 In fact, Sir John Braunche ascended to the office of alderman for London’s Cripplegate ward in 1571 (despite his protestations

48 Fuidge, 450.
50 Ralph Houlbrooke, “Dun, Sir Daniel (1544/5-1617),” ODNB.
and a royal exemption) and lord mayor of London in 1580. In 1553, Anne became the widow of Robert Donne, a resident of St. Botolph’s parish, Aldersgate ward. Her late husband provided in his will for their three young sons, Daniel, William, and Nicholas, to come under the care of Sir John and Thomas Braunche upon his death. In his 1581-2 journal, though, Stonley recorded payments for Daniel’s and William’s “scoller’s” charges during their education at Oxford, and he regularly noted cordial interactions with each of his stepsons. Perhaps Anne’s boys transferred into his care following his marriage to their mother.

Richard and Anne were likely married before the birth of their first surviving daughter, Dorothy, in 1560. Their second surviving child, Anne, was born about four years later. Both women were of marriageable-age themselves when Stonley set out to pen his 1581-2 journal. Jason Scott-Warren cites Dorothy’s betrothal to William Dawtrey, son of a known recusant also named William Dawtrey, as a possible indicator of Stonley’s religious complexion. This may be the case indeed. Until his death in 1589, William Dawtrey was a regular guest at Stonley’s table. Upon his passing, Stonley commissioned a small monument in the chancel of St. Dunstan’s Stepney bearing this inscription: “William Dawtrey, a squire of Sussex, the son and heir of William Dawtrey,
formerly of Lincoln’s Inn; Richard Stonley, squire, has erected this token with love and piety for a man of character and sharp mind, distinguished with an uncommon knowledge of English provincial law.”56 Stonley’s second daughter, Anne, married William Heigham, and he too appears in Stonley’s journals as a constant dinner guest, legal advisor, and confidant.

Stonley was intertwined within London’s patronage network during the second half of the Tudor century. He had a particularly strong relationship with the Essex branch of the Petre family, many of whom owned houses near his own in Aldersgate and Essex. Scott-Warren has seen this as further evidence of Stonley’s Catholic complexion, which seems plausible. The teller was a common dinner companion of Lady Anne Petre—widow of the “Tudor secretary” Sir William Petre. She even left Stonley ten pounds upon her death in 1582.57 The widowed Petre was an “uncompromising Catholic” in the words of F. G. Emmison, and the building that survives her still bears the hiding holes that priests had used during their stay at Ingatestone Hall.58 Still, during the sixteenth century, most Petres kept their religion below radar, benefiting from Elizabeth I’s refusal to make windows into men’s souls. And not all Petres were closet Catholics, it seems. In 1593, Stonley was a “chef morner” in the funeral of his overseer, Robert Petre, writer of tallies

57 Folger 459, 8r, 10r, 19r, 20r, 50v. See also TNA PCC PROB 11/64/153; this is the “Will of Dame Anne Peter, Widow of Ingatestone, Essex,” recorded 26 April 1582. Leading local historian F.G. Emmison has dubbed Sir William Petre thus in his magnificent survey of Sir William’s papers, Tudor Secretary.
58 Lady Anne ran into some trouble for housing the priest John Payne at Ingatestone Hall during the 1570s. Emmison, 291-292.
and auditor of the Receipt of the Exchequer. Stonley’s journals evince a longstanding relationship with this man, whom Irene Cassidy has claimed to be a puritan. Whether he “winked” at or worshipped with them, Richard Stonley was firmly ensconced within the Petre patronage network.

Following his appointment as teller, Stonley appears in a variety of state records receiving cash payments in multiple currencies, “chestering up” at the exchequer, disbursing money for a variety of reasons. It is clear also that at some point during the 1550s or 60s, he began using his position as teller to front the rent for a number of properties throughout southern England, eventually including lands and buildings in London, Berkshire, Kent, Essex, Warwickshire, Oxfordshire, Sussex, and Buckinghamshire. Despite engaging in property speculation with the queen’s money, Stonley also garnered the additional privilege of receiving the country’s first fruits and tenths in 1560. In 1571, he was one of two Members of Parliament to represent Newton,

59 Folger 460, 33
61 See for instance, United Kingdom, PRO, Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reigns of Edward VI, Mary I, and Elizabeth I, 1547-1580, (London, 1956), 59, 146, 158, 317, 191, 583; United Kingdom, PRO, Calendar of State Papers Foreign Series, of the Reign of Elizabeth 1561-1562, ed. Joseph Stephenson (London: 1869), 295. Stonley’s name peppers a variety of other accounts as well.
62 Fuidge, 450.
63 The first fruits and tenths were taxes belonging to the Papacy. In 1534, however, the Tudor monarch Henry VIII dissolved his relationship with the Pope, established his the Church of England, and rerouted the payment of the Holy See’s taxes into his own coffers. Stonley retained this privilege until 1578. See Fuidge, 450.
a borough in Lancashire.\textsuperscript{64} By the time that Elizabeth I entered the third decade of her reign, he was the most senior teller within the exchequer.

“Artifice or Accident?” The Transformation of the Tudor Exchequer

Stonley’s tenure at the Exchequer of Receipt occurred at an interesting time. Early in the Tudor century, the English government began to reorganize its system of auditing the Crown’s accounts and handling its currency. The Exchequer of Account or “upper house” of the exchequer generally performed the former task, while the Exchequer of Receipt or “lower house” dealt with the latter.\textsuperscript{65} Both houses experienced significant changes in how they handled these responsibilities. One of these included the rerouting of the Crown’s cash away from the exchequer’s own money chests and into the private custody of the tellers themselves. This measure brought a significant quantity of cash into the homes of the four tellers—a quantity that grew when the Marian government dissolved the position of the custodian of the revenue courts in 1555. This meant that more of the queen’s money flowed into the exchequer’s lower house than ever before. Hence Christopher Coleman has indicated that “the tellers, who together had handled about £80,000 a year in Edward VI’s reign, now found themselves handling about £265,000, never less than 75 per cent and sometimes as much as 95 per cent of the Crown’s centrally administered income.”\textsuperscript{66}

\textsuperscript{64} Fuidge, 450.
\textsuperscript{65} See Geoffrey Elton, “The Elizabethan Exchequer: War in the Receipt,” Elizabethan Government and Society, ed. S.T. Bindoff, J. Hurstfield, and C.H. Williams (London: University of London, 1961), 214-216; Christopher Coleman, “Artifice or Accident? The Reorganization of the Exchequer of the Receipt, c. 1554-1572,” Revolution Reassessed: Revisions in the History of Tudor Government and Administration, ed. Christopher Coleman and David Starkey, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), 166-168. Elton envisions these developments taking place during the reign of Henry VII. His student, Coleman, is more hesitant to calculate their origins, noting simply that “for reasons that were controversial” the medieval system of accounting established under Henry II was “set aside, and by 1533 the Lower Exchequer showed little trace of them” (167).
\textsuperscript{66} Coleman, 169.
The exchequer underwent another important innovation in the early years of the Tudor monarchy. At this time, the government effectively abolished the upper house’s ability to track the money flowing through the tellers’ hands. When Stonley received his appointment, the lord treasurer of the exchequer’s deputy in the lower house—the undertreasurer—was the sole figure in charge of recording the cash reserves in the tellers’ chests. Incidentally, between the 1550s and the 1590s, a number of figures stepped forward to contest the undertreasurer’s control over these accounts. One was the lord treasurer himself, whose money-managing prerogatives within the lower house had largely devolved onto his appointees by the reign of Mary. In a bid to regain power over the Crown’s money, Lord Treasurer William Paulet, Marquis of Winchester, began a personal campaign to reorganize the exchequer during the end of Mary’s rule. He reinvested a representative of the upper house with the power to audit the tellers’ coffers, sapping the authority of the undertreasurer and his representatives. He also entered into a special relationship with one of the tellers so as to gain more direct control over the Crown’s revenues. The man he selected was Richard Stonley. Winchester endowed Stonley with the power to handle some £1,171,050 of Elizabeth I’s money between Michaelmas 1558 and Michaelmas 1566—an amount that represented fifty-two percent of the queen’s return during that period.67

Stonley received vast sums of cash during the third quarter of the sixteenth century, and the state papers of this era reveal as much. He used some of this capital for private aims. In addition to borrowing the queen’s cash to buy land, he lent to family members and peers. He even greased the palms of Lord Treasurer Winchester.68 John

---

67 Coleman, 186. Michaelmas is the Christian feast day of Saint Michael, and it occurs on September 29.
68 Ibid., 187.
Guy has averred that many in the royal government who knew about the use of public money for private funding and lending did not judge it wrong “in principle,” and in fact, there was an increasing “tolerance of dishonesty” in central government during Elizabeth’s reign.\textsuperscript{69} Such activity was nearly a perquisite of office, and it was prevalent throughout the exchequer. Yet when all but one teller defaulted on their accounts in 1571, costing the Crown £44,000 in absent coin, the ensuing political fallout was anything but cavalier. Stonley was one of the defaulters. Winchester was disgraced by the scandal, which may have helped to precipitate his natural death in 1572. The government soon enacted a law providing that those who failed “to pay over all receipts within two months of a warning” would face execution.\textsuperscript{70} Nonetheless, directly after its ratification, William Cecil, Lord Burghley, who replaced Winchester as lord treasurer upon his death, abrogated the act and sponsored another, which mandated debtor’s prison for offending tellers.\textsuperscript{71} The wording of this second act was imperfect, and the tellers continued to borrow from the royal purse with near impunity.

Waning Fortunes toward the Tudor \textit{Fin de Siècle}

Stonley’s mishandling of Crown reserves truly began to catch up with him during the 1580s. In the first year of that decade, the teller was compelled to offer a declaration of his estate for public record, which stated “the losses and hindrances he has sustained in the time of his 27 years service.”\textsuperscript{72} He was defamed, furthermore, along with his brother-

\textsuperscript{71} Ibid., 173.
\textsuperscript{72} United Kingdom, PRO, \textit{Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reigns of Edward VI, Mary [I], and Elizabeth [I]}, 1547-1580, (London, 1956), 661.
in-law Robert Braunche—soon-to-be lord mayor of London—for unexplained “injurious dealings” during that same year.\(^7\) Yet worse was still to come. In its bid to finance the brewing conflict with Spain, the Crown began in 1585 to retract the cash reserves that had accumulated in the exchequer. Doing so threw Stonley’s precarious position into greater relief. The state papers of Elizabeth I reveal that in 1586 Stonley was “unable to make up his accounts by £16,000”—a circumstance that forced him “to lay the burthen on the other three tellers.”\(^7\)

Stonley continued to function as the queen’s teller, maintaining personal control of Crown revenues despite these embarrassments. He also continued to speculate, acquiring a small manor and rectory in Essex in 1585 and 1587, respectively.\(^7\) These would be among his last major acquisitions. In 1588, Stonley offered Lord Burghley an itemized list of lands to be sold, valued at over £4,500, to satisfy a portion of his £13,000 debt to the queen. Stonley attached a petition to this list asking for the forgiveness of various sums from the latter amount, which included £4,000 stolen from his chests, £500 overcharged to his accounts, and £200 lost “by sundry falls of the coin.”\(^7\) Later that year, Cecil instructed Robert Petre to rescind Stonley’s authorization to receive payments in the name of the queen.\(^7\) The beleaguered teller protested with a letter, which Cecil

\(^7\) Ibid., 701.  
\(^7\) United Kingdom, PRO, Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Elizabeth I, 1581-1590, (London, 1967), 343.  
received soon after, decrying “I desire no more but the receiving of the money, and Mr. Peter to lock it up presently, whereby her Majesty can take no loss [...] And if I may not do this my credit is lost, and I shall be hereafter the less able to pay my debt.”

Stonley’s 1593-4 journals indicate that the forlorn teller was, in a limited capacity, eventually permitted to receive the queen’s money again, a grant that was surely calculated to provide him with the necessary “credit” to resolve this crisis.

Burghley kept Stonley in the exchequer, quietly pressuring him to get his affairs in order. As his superior, the lord treasurer likely feared that the repercussions of Stonley’s embezzlement would act “as reason for his owne Discharge,” as the teller’s journal indicates. Stonley remained in this suspended state for another eleven years until, after he evinced a continuing inability to pay his debt to the queen, she confiscated some of his lands and possessions and threw him into debtor’s prison. He continued working toward resolving his royal debt, yet he likely died in the process, still insolvent, in 1600.

Richard Stonley’s journals grant us textual images of their originator that work with and against the biography sketched above. Largely based on government documents, the preceding profile of Stonley provides a necessary touchstone for the analysis of those images. It also introduces us to most of the main characters in the following drama. As we shall see, the selves contained in the moving lines of Stonley’s surviving journals correlate in a variety of ways to the changing circumstances of the teller’s life.

79 Folger 460, 58’.
CHAPTER III

“CONSIDER HOW IT STANDS UPON MY CREDIT”: PURPOSE AND IDENTITY IN STONLEY’S JOURNALS

Some years ago, Stephen Greenblatt observed that a few sixteenth-century Englishmen exhibited “an increased self-consciousness about the fashioning of human identity as a manipulable, artful process.” This argument is interesting in light of recent claims by Meredith Anne Skura and Adam Smyth. Smyth’s study of early modern English autobiography has affirmed Skura’s vision of a gulf between “modern expectations of autobiography” and its “sixteenth-century enactments.” While Smyth and Skura have shown many ways in which early modern autobiographies seem different than modern ones, two are especially notable. Early modern autobiography, said Smyth, “was less preoccupied with what we call subjectivity or individuality […] and it produced written lives that were ‘always part of some other occasion.’” How can one reconcile Greenblatt’s and Smyth’s seemingly discordant judgments about the written self in Tudor England? This chapter offers an answer by assessing Richard Stonley’s journals.

---

81 Smyth, 7.
82 Skura qtd. in Smyth, 7.
As we shall see, Stonley’s journals exhibit purpose-driven self-fashioning. In this regard, they are comparable to other examples of elite egolitutare written during the sixteenth century and the surrounding years. The teller’s near contemporary, Lady Anne Clifford, employed a diary to engineer a legally-viable portrait of herself as the rightful heir to her father’s property.\(^83\) Keen to provide a demonstration of faith to their respective children, Lady Grace Mildmay and Richard Rogers fashioned their intimate sixteenth-century diaries partly as personal testaments for target audiences.\(^84\) Despite whatever instances of self-fashioning Stonley’s texts contain, however, it is clear that he did not intend for himself to become the central subject of his writing. The handcrafted self that appears in Stonley’s work is mostly incidental to the “other occasions” and purposes that his journals served. This chapter will discuss those purposes.

Even though Richard Stonley attempted to fashion an image of himself in writing, his journals harbor other images of the author, which further “authors” have the potential to uncover. These images are rooted in notes that served a variety of purposes, some of which were quite distinct from one another. Moreover, the many ways that Stonley used

\(^{83}\) Katherine O. Acheson has argued that Anne Clifford’s diary of 1616-1619 (i.e. her Knole diary) “survives because of the legal conflicts that Clifford wanted to document for the further uses of her family members and herself.” See the introduction to her edition of Clifford’s early self-writings, *The Memoir of 1603 and the Diary of 1616-1619* (New York: Broadview, 2007), 26. Likewise, Megan Matchinski has asserted the diary’s “evidentiary role” in Clifford’s struggle to justify her legal claim to her father’s property. See Matchinski’s “Serial Identity: History, Gender, and Form in the Diary Writing of Lady Anne Clifford,” *Genre and Women’s Life Writing in Early Modern England*, ed. Michelle M. Dowd and Julie A. Eckerle (Burlington: Ashgate, 2007), 67.

\(^{84}\) Retha M. Warnicke has claimed that Mildmay “attempted to draw information from her life together within a framework for educating her descendants in the benefits of living religiously and virtuously.” See her “Lady Mildmay’s Journal: A Study in Autobiography and Meditation in Reformation England,” *Sixteenth Century Journal* 20.1 (Spring 1989): 56. Another of the godly, Richard Rogers, left his “written lectures and papers” to his sons “Danyell and Ezekiel and […] my Cosen Rogers […]” See Richard Rogers, *Will and Testament, New England Historical and Genealogical Register* Vol. 12, ed. John Ward Dean (Albany, 1863), 327. It would be wholly unsurprising if Rogers’s diary was included among those papers, given Tom Webster’s claim that puritan diarists often had a “concern for posterity” that conditioned their writings (39).
his journals changed during their inscription, giving rise to new images in turn. Some of these changes are likely related to developments that occurred in other journals, now lost. The following lines consider the consistent and changing uses of Stonley’s surviving works. By doing so, they provide context for an analysis of the fluctuating images of Richard Stonley contained therein.

At a basic level, then, this section ponders why Richard Stonley wrote his journals. Based on the surviving evidence, it argues that he wrote for a number of reasons, which were mostly financial, religious, or educational in nature. On a deeper level, the queen’s teller imbued his texts with signals that helped him to convey certain images of himself. But these images competed with others that had diverse and sometimes inconsistent applications. Furthermore, the images and applications of Stonley’s texts changed according to his circumstances and locations. The emphasis on how the changing textures of Stonley’s life influenced his writing speaks to this study’s aim of offering an anthropology of a manuscript, and it provides a view of these texts as something more than a means of cultural capital.

The 1581-2 Journal

In act four, scene one of Shakespeare’s “Comedy of Errors,” the merchant Angelo quarrels with Antipholus of Ephesus over a golden chain delivered unknowingly to his twin brother, Antipholus of Syracuse. Unaware that Angelo’s work has fallen into his brother’s hands, Antipholus of Ephesus denies him payment on account of his failure to receive the piece. “You know I gave it you half an hour since,” asserts Angelo, who requires the money to pay an overdue debt. “You gave me none,” responds Ephesus,
“you wrong me much to say so.” To this, the merchant replies, “You wrong me more, sir, in denying it: / Consider how it stands upon my credit.”

The significance of this final line is notable in the present context. By relating the denigration of his word to the status of his credit, Angelo offers an important insight into the nature of credit relationships in early modern England. Craig Muldrew has recently examined this topic, showing that credit relations already entailed a pervasive network of social obligations by the late-sixteenth century in England. Elizabethans engaged in this network by constructing their credit culturally “in a sense that would have been interpreted positively by others.” For this reason, the cold contents of a Tudor Englander’s purse did not necessarily validate his or her financial reliability, yet a good and trustworthy reputation did. Hence the fictional Angelo fears that a slight to his integrity will damage his credit. A creditable repute had a variety of other indicators as well: a commitment to reciprocity, charity, faithfulness, hospitality, and community. In this proto-capitalist economy, self-interest was opprobrious.

Ceri Sullivan has added to the scholarship of credit relations in early modern England by studying the rhetoric of credit in English writing. According to Sullivan, English society made no clear distinctions between trade activities and what are often perceived as “private” concerns today. Many merchant handbooks offered methods of enhancing credit within “personal” financial accounts. They instructed their readers to assimilate the “guarantors of [a merchant’s] faith: accuracy, clarity, systematized recording, discretion, a shrewd judgment of people, and a display of godliness.”

---

85 William Shakespeare, *The Comedy of Errors*, 4.1.75-78.
86 Muldrew, 123.
87 Ibid., 166.
88 Sullivan, 26.
last point finds an anchor in John Mellis’s injunction to “call to minde the name of God in all such writings” in his 1588 treatise on merchant handbooks—a point that Stonley took to heart.89 Stonley used his 1581-2 journal, which bore his financial accounts, for the purpose of credit construction, and this work often exhibits a conspicuous kind of piety, a sense of discretion, and a degree of systematization that will become apparent below.

Though Stonley’s earliest surviving journal was a part of a corpus of credit symbols, it served other purposes that intersected with and sometimes contradicted this use. On a basic level, the better part of the journal functioned as a practical record of receipt and expenditure, and a link in what Adam Smyth has called a “lengthy chain of textual transmission and revision.”90 In his 1581-2 writing, Stonley often transferred bills and bonds “from the box” into his work. In the opening pages, for instance, he acknowledged a charge for the legal counsel of a Mr. Abdey “as by his bill in the box of A. may appere.”91 He also copied his journal’s financial entries into a separate “book of accomptes.”92 These activities resonate with the contents of merchant handbooks encouraging a tripartite system of accounting. As noted in chapter one, Stonley owned one of these texts and certainly would have known about these systems.

Stonley’s 1581-2 journal served other uses as well. It functioned as a repository for Biblical excerpts and chapter summaries—a use which reveals the teller’s creditable commitment to moral and mental improvement. It was also a record of daily events and activities. Stonley inscribed a variety of observations in these records, sometimes cross

89 John Mellis, *A briefe instruction and maner how to keepe books of accomptes after the order of debtor and creditor* (London: 1588).
90 Smyth, 2.
91 Folger 459, 3r; also 38r, 41r, 93v.
92 Folger 459, 6r; also 18r, 36r. These are not to be confused with Stonley’s Exchequer “accompts.”
referencing or comparing them with other writings. So in August 1582, he related a notation on “a sermon mad by o[u]r minister mr Cottesford” to a separate “note boke of sermons.”93 He referenced “my book of Charges in lawe” in an entry about a court case before the “Iudge at the Common Place [i.e. pleas].”94 Within these “diaristic” entries, he was also keen to copy down news items about the queen’s relationship status, for instance, or the trials of Edmund Campion, a Jesuit priest. He discussed his movements around London and the surrounding countryside. He recorded notable community events, like the marriage of a former servant and the birth of a patron’s child. He noted household guests and meetings with prominent Londoners. Introducing and concluding nearly every dairistic entry in his 1581-2 journal are variants of the phrases “This morning after prayer I…,” and “with thankes to god at night.” As Smyth has argued, the necessities of truth and fullness—two “guaranteers of the merchant’s faith”—often found their “narrative equivalent in diaries that strained for the effect of conveying the whole day.”95 Therefore, while Stonley’s daily ruminations served a variety of contingent uses—as referent points and records of news, travel, life events, and other miscellanea—their format supported the development of a godly, and thus creditable, image.96

The format of Stonley’s 1581-2 journal essentially exhibits three main composite parts. The first includes a brief passage or heading from the Geneva Bible. Below this Stonley usually copied a list of purchases. Here is Stonley’s “Journall or […] daylie

---

93 Folger 459, 70’.
94 Folger 459, 45’.
95 Smyth, 68.
96 Even so, God Himself serves a relatively minimal role in Stonley’s journals. Despite religion’s strong role in these texts, they were clearly not the kind of deity-centered writings that Puritans like Richard Rogers and Nehemiah Wallington composed. See Knappen’s edition of Rogers’s diary and Paul Seaver’s Wallington’s World: A Puritan Artisan in Seventeenth-Century London (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1985), for a critical examination of Wallington’s voluminous writings.
book,” which he used in conjunction with other financial records to track expenses. The final portion of Stonley’s broadly-termed journal contains a diaristic entry concerning what he did or saw on a particular day. A heading, which includes the calendar date and the day of the week, appears before each entry displaying these composite parts.

In illustration, below the date of his first entry (marked June 16, 1581), Richard Stonley began his earliest surviving journal with a pious pronouncement in Latin petitioning God’s presence over what followed. He then recorded a Bible verse—Psalms 135: 4-5, a rumination on God’s enduring mercy. Thereafter begins a list of charges. The reader learns of Stonley’s bills for a servant’s riding costs, a grandson’s wet nurse, and paperwork for the purchase of land and legal advice. Lastly, Stonely recorded his “bote hier”—a bill that places him on muddy banks of the Thames, hailing passage on an early modern water taxi in order to bypass the boisterous mile-and-a-half-long trek from his house on Aldersgate Street to Westminster Hall. In the final portion of this entry, Stonley wrote of keeping “Westminster and at home as the day before with thankes to god at night.”

There are a number of ways to read Stonley’s records for that day. The conspicuous piety of the Latin inscription, Biblical passage, and nighttime prayer, which bookend the entry’s contents, is immediately recognizable. So too is the fulfillment of Stonley’s financial responsibility to those under his aegis. Movement is a potential theme in this entry, visible in Stonley’s water ride to Westminster. Another involves the accumulation of goods and services through a network of merchants and servants. Stonley did not employ every aspect of his opening entry for the purpose of credit.

97 Folger 459, 2'.
construction. Still, the interconnectedness of these notations and the “display of godliness” that surrounds them are significant features of Stonley’s self-fashioning as a reputable man.

Stonley recorded a variety of culturally-weighted activities throughout his 1581-2 journal that helped him to sustain his image as a man of credit, even as these records served other practical purposes. He appeared to maintain an estate in good order. Like an ideal master, he took care of his servants, tenants, and workers by providing for their necessities, monitoring their duties, and offering customary rewards. In his 1581-2 journal, Stonley noted at least seventeen servants and day laborers spread out over his properties. During 1582, Stonley assessed his payment of servants’ wages and upkeep at forty-three pounds, eight shillings, and five pence. In March 1582, he recorded a disbursement for spring livery coats that totaled over nine pounds. Expenses for servants’ apparel appear elsewhere in his accounts. He also copied receipts of reimbursement to his chief servant and money carrier, Henry Makpes. And he detailed “reparacon” costs for maintaining his tenants’ living quarters.

He also noted sixteen pounds, forty-two shillings, and four pence as the sum of the reward money offered to servants and others. Below a June 1581 heading, Stonley recorded a reward of twenty shillings for his maid “nurse Tomlyn to releve her in her Sicknes.” To John Taylor, a tenant and water carrier, he offered a shilling for bringing

---

98 Folger 459, 99”.
99 Folger 459 52’. Interestingly Stonley’s sum total for this purchase is a few shillings less than the draper’s bill. Here we see one of the inevitable mistakes in Stonley’s calculations that contradict his program of “accurate” credit construction.
100 Ibid.
101 Folger 459, 6’.
a gelding named “old Jane” to his Duddinghurst manor. According to the convention of the times, he tipped those beyond his immediate circles as well. In July 1581, Stonley rewarded Luke, the recorder of London’s servant, for services rendered. He inscribed a gift of two shillings to the lord mayor of London’s officer for “a maydes marriage.” He offered ten shillings to his son-in-law’s man “at his mariage.” Stonley was unstinting with the needy. He conspicuously recorded the mandatory payment of alms to “pore” families and neighbors in need as well as the rate of his church taxes. In each of these ways, Stonely appears in his 1581-2 journal as a good and generous lord, whose care and liberality was exchanged with or bestowed prudently on deserving individuals within his household and those from varying distances beyond.

He wrote of providing for his kin and showering them with gifts too. In doing so, Stonley signaled his proper execution of patriarchal duties. Ilana Krausman Ben-Amos has noted that these obligations often encompassed an unequal exchange in which parents offered more than they could ever hope to recoup. So it was with Richard Stonley. In the first pages of his earliest surviving journal, he inscribed a gift of twenty-seven pounds to his daughter Anne Heigham for the upkeep of his house, which she and her husband occupied. After this, he made subsequent payments to her, sometimes as much as forty pounds, “as by the other book may appere.” Throughout this journal, Stonley gave money for children’s and grandchildren’s apparel, school tuition, and “boardwages.”
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102 Folger 459, 70v.
103 Folger 459, 9v.
104 Folger 459, 17v.
105 Folger 459, 26v.
107 Folger 459, 1v.
December 1582, he described buying his elder daughter Dorothy a “friz gowne” costing two shillings and eleven pence.\textsuperscript{108} Two months prior to this, Stonley appeared before an Essex court “in the behalf of my brother Edward” to sue for the right to purchase a property there. He stood surety to his brother’s claim, agreeing to bear the costs of his rival’s litigation if that claim proved to be false. Stonley concluded the deal by offering a hand to his opponent “in the presence of two of his frends.”\textsuperscript{109} Some months later, he settled the deal “declared by word of mowth” for the property in Estham.\textsuperscript{110} The agreement entailed the conveyance of twenty-two pounds to Stonley’s rival “so my Brother [may be able] to enioy the manor of Estham.”\textsuperscript{111} This series of excerpts portray Stonley as a pillar of family finance, ready to engage in litigation to protect familial interests.

Richard Stonley showed his munificence—and bolstered his credit—elsewhere in his earliest journal. To different degrees throughout this writing, he recorded the presence of dinner and supper guests at his table. These included family members, neighbors, and acquaintances. Felicity Heal has argued for the importance of hospitality within the social history of England. This virtue was a requirement, not a preference, of early modern households, and its principle elements were food, drink, and entertainment. “Strangers,” or those who did not bear association to a particular family, were often singled out in prescriptive literature as deserving recipients of hospitality. Family and the poor were

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{108} Folger 459, 94'.
\textsuperscript{109} Folger 459, 26'.
\textsuperscript{110} This entry serves as a reminder of the persistent power of oral pronouncements in early modern English society. Adam Fox has discussed this in his \textit{Oral and Literate Culture in England, 1500-1700} (New York: Clarendon Press, 2000). See chapter five in particular.
\textsuperscript{111} Folger 459, 66'.
\end{flushleft}
also implicated within varying spheres of household liberality. Overall, Heal has noted that “honour and reputation attached to good lordship, generosity, and the appearance of an open household: these were sentiments generally expressed in early modern English culture.”

In a September 1581 entry, Stonley acknowledged having his parish minister and others over to Sunday dinner. This was not an isolated occurrence. On Christmas Day and St. Stephen’s Day, he listed about twenty dinner companions. From this time onward, Stonley seems to have placed a greater emphasis on his records of mealtime guests, though his enthusiasm for these notations ebbed and flowed throughout 1582. In November, when he began to record detailed lists of his food purchases instead of generic costs for “vittell,” Stonley’s guest lists appear somewhat fuller and more systematized. Under bills stocked with bread, butter, bear, ale, mustard, fish, mutton, and oysters, the teller sketched entries like the following: “This day after morning pryer I occupied my self as the day before having with me At dyner my Sonne Dawtrye mr newman and others and at supper mr newman mr selby and others.” Such care in naming dinner and supper guests as well as “others” does not appear regularly in Stonley’s records for the prior year. These entries perhaps testify to the fact that even while Stonley’s concern with credit formation was a determinant in the composition of his 1581-2 journal, it expressed
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113 Folger 459, 19r.
114 Folger 459, 38r-38v. St. Steven’s day is December 26th.
115 Folger 459, 87r.
itself differently as different notions and necessities came to the foreground of his textual enterprise.

If the generosity inscribed in Stonley’s activities and expenses projected a certain credit score, his particular brand of piety had the same creditable connotations. His constant refrains “this morning after prayer I…” and “with thankes to god at night” acted as systematic reminders of a credit-earning faith. Even so, faith was an enormously important aspect of Stonley’s life. These lines served to display an honest practice of daily prayer while conveying a creditable image.

This Elizabethan official marked other “displays of godliness” throughout his 1581-2 journal. He often recorded church attendance. Despite whatever religious sentiments he may have harbored beyond his records, his journal conveys the image of a man deeply invested in the Elizabethan settlement. Under the heading for September 10, 1581, Stonley offered an extended observation on the course of a service at his parish church:

At this morning service was first rede serten psalmes and lessons contrary to The order of the book of Comon prayer Lykwise A part of one of the gospel and last of all the epistle of the day[. The minister] nether preyed for the Quene in the beginning nor end of his Sermon[. He] envoyed agenst Bisshop and Doctors preyd in his prayer to have the church restored to the Auncient order of Elders and deakens

These comments and others like them have prompted Christopher Haigh to deem Stonley an “antipuritan.” The teller’s antipuritanism perhaps becomes more interesting in light

\[16\] Folger 459, 19’.
\[17\] See for example Folger 459, 21’. See also Christopher Haigh, “The Character of an Antipuritan” *Sixteenth Century Journal* 35.3 (Fall 2004), 671-688 (especially 686).
of the fact that his participation in the Eucharist always garnered a manicule.\textsuperscript{118} While these markings might add weight to Scott-Warren’s view of Stonley’s religious complexion, they also portray a man committed to the queen’s \textit{via media}.

Stonley’s godliness reveals itself in other ways. Though displays of godliness in early modern culture were not relegated to explicitly religious activities, these displays are overwhelmingly present in Stonley’s commitment to the religion of the book. On many afternoons, the teller engaged himself in the “reading of the scriptures.”\textsuperscript{119} The “liminal” reading notes that appear below each heading in his 1581-2 journal correspond sequentially to verses and headings from the books of the Geneva Bible. Stonley also recorded the purchase of several religious titles. In August 1581, he found himself browsing the cluttered bookstalls crammed into the churchyard beside St. Paul’s Cathedral, which stood a mere quarter mile from his Aldersgate Street residence. There, beside the most prominent edifice in Tudor London, the teller paid ten pence for Thomas Stocker’s translation of Jean Calvin’s \textit{Immortality of the Soule}, newly available from Fleet Street.\textsuperscript{120} He bought a host of devotional, disputatious, and referential religious titles. Jason Scott-Warren has observed that spirituality appears, unsurprisingly, to be a central concern within the teller’s library, which displays reformed and “papysticall” works in tandem.\textsuperscript{121} As he notes, the presence of the former renders him with “plenty of

\textsuperscript{118} A manicule is a small icon, shaped like a hand, used to signify important or curious events in texts. For a brilliant, extended discussion of the manicule, see William Sherman, \textit{Used Books: Marking Readers in Renaissance England} (Philadelphia: University Pennsylvania Press, 2008), 25-52.

\textsuperscript{119} Stonley noted doing so twenty-five times in his 1581-2 journal.


ammunition to rebut allegations of backsliding.”\textsuperscript{122} Still, one cannot be certain of how exactly Stonley read these works without further research into his religious reading habits. The teller’s bookish display of godliness was not simply an exercise in credit construction, as noted above, but notations like “kept home reading the Scriptures all the afternone” did nothing to detract from his creditable image.\textsuperscript{123}

Jason Scott-Warren has asserted that Stonley’s accounts and his corpus of books bore similarly financial meanings: “While the former contributes to his literal treasure, the latter enriches his symbolic or cultural capital.”\textsuperscript{124} The fact of Stonley’s drive for bookish self-betterment, a drive that saturates the content of his earliest journal, arguably serves to strengthen his creditable image. Numerous titles appear in his list of purchases within this journal, though these were only a fraction of the works he owned. Stonley’s habitual observation “kept home at my books all the afternoon” also illustrates the persistence of his attachment to books. Yet books were not the only texts that Stonley consumed. In October 1581 Stonley wrote of spending four pence “for Bookes and Ballads touching Campion and Ducket,” the Jesuits.\textsuperscript{125} He also seems to have copied a broadside regarding the Campion affair into his journal—a fact which the format and phrasing of the entry signals.\textsuperscript{126} He was even familiar with a “pamphlet bok” written against “busye flaterers favorers or whisperers” in Campion’s cause.\textsuperscript{127} One can read

\textsuperscript{122} Ibid., 246.
\textsuperscript{123} Folger 459, 22v.
\textsuperscript{125} Folger 459, 12v. Joad Raymond has discussed Stonley’s interest in the Campion incident in Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britian, 37, though he inaccurately noted that Stonley “followed the story from prison.”
\textsuperscript{126} Folger 459, 31.
\textsuperscript{127} Folger 459, 33v. This is an anonymous pamphlet entitled An advertisement and defence for trueth against her backbiters (1581). A digital copy is available via Early English Books Online.
these entries, along with Stonley’s maniculed notations on court politics or the queen’s liaisons with the Duke of Alençon as evidence of his participation within what Adam Fox has called that “dynamic process of reciprocal interaction and mutual infusion” that characterized the interaction of early modern “oral, scribal, and printed media.”

Moreover, these entries portray Stonley as a newsmonger on the cusp of a watershed decade of pamphlet production. These were the gentler years before the Marprelate tracts when “the condemnations of other pamphleteers were less ad hominem, greater decorum was observed, and, despite mutual recriminations, there was little railing.” Still, as Joad Raymond has claimed, pamphlet works had garnered a disreputable status over the course of the second half of the Tudor century. Did Stonley’s use of them decrease his “symbolic or cultural capital?” Herein lies one of the paradoxes of Stonley’s writings: though they functioned to establish the teller’s credit, other uses, spaces, materials, and frames of mind frequently contradicted that effort.

Stonley fashioned himself as a man of credit by appearing to be a dutiful servant of the queen. His attendance at Westminster pervades his earliest journal. His movement and action in the Crown’s employ are constant features as well. Stonley also tracked notable disbursements from the royal coffers. In August 1581, he used a manicule to accentuate his payment of £6,114 “in pistolettes to the L harry Seymor […] to be by hym delyverid over to such parsons he shalbe directed be yound the Seas.” He drew another manicule in the margins of a June 1582 entry, recording “this day after morning preyer I went to westminster delivered ther serten spanyshe coyne with other of my fellowes.”

128 Fox, 410.
129 Raymond, Pamphlets and Pamphleteering, 37.
130 Folger 459, 16’.
131 Folger 459, 70’.
The Tudor teller demonstrated a conspicuously high regard for the queen by recording flowery notices each year on her birthday. A manicule sits beside his entry for November 17, 1581, in which he wrote, “and this day the Queenes majestie began the xiiiijth yere of her highness reigne over this realme of England whom I besech almighty god Longe to Reign over us.”132 One year later, he petitioned God to “send her a prosperous government with many yeres to reign over us to godes pleasure and or comforts.”133 Though Stonley had declared in 1580 certain “losses and hindrances” to his accounts during his twenty-seven year service to the Crown, no hint of these difficulties appear in his first journal.134 Instead Stonley seems the queen’s dutiful and trustworthy servant throughout.

Stonley’s record of association with high-ranking officials and his participation in elite activities added to his credit. During summer 1581, the teller wrote of his routine presence at his brother-in-law, the lord mayor of London’s table, where he found both food and entertainment.135 He defended the mayor’s credit when a scurrilous and “most false” note was pinned to his gate by some “envious person.”136 Stonley broke bread with the lord chief justice in April 1582.137 He dealt regularly with Sir Richard Martin, whom he witnessed succeed to the office of sheriff of London.138 He sold property to Lord Treasurer Burghley in late 1581.139 In addition to engaging in a handshake deal arbitrated

132 Folger 459, 31v.
133 Folger 459, 87v.
134 United Kingdom, PRO, Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reigns of Edward VI, Mary [I], and Elizabeth [I], 1547-1580, (London, 1956), 661.
135 Stonley writes in particular of enjoying the spectacle of a two-foot “dwarf” who offered entertainment. Folger 459, 3v.
136 Folger 459, 21v.
137 Folger 459, 55v.
138 Folger 459, 11v.
139 Folger 459, 24v.
by Walter Mildmay, the lord chancellor of the Exchequer of Account, he visited regularly with various members of the Petre family. In August 1582, Stonley’s journal revealed that he “huntid in the park” with Mildmay, Petre, and “other gentlemen.”\textsuperscript{140} In these ways, the author fashioned himself as a notable individual, who engaged in patronage relationships as a worthy client—if not also as a man desirous of climbing the social ladder.

The image of Stonley as a man of credit is not the only one that his earliest journal offers. Contrary to this image, one might read this journal as an expression of the teller’s attachment to worldly goods. Between June 1581 and December 1582, Stonley spent more than forty-five pounds on apparel. His accounts evince a taste for fustian doublets, Spanish-style jerkins, taffeta hats, and French garters. Gowns of silk and lace populate his receipts, though as Scott-Warren has observed, “a massive tailor’s bill looks less sinful when it is prefaced by a biblical excerpt about the calamities that God sent to his church in order to test his children.”\textsuperscript{141} Charges for ironwork, carpentry, and plumbing also appear. In August 1581, Stonley acknowledged a brief stop at Estham “to see the carpinters work” before his return to London.\textsuperscript{142} He noted a total of over twenty-six pounds paid for unspecified building costs during 1582.\textsuperscript{143} He made significant land purchases and tended his properties with a watchful eye. Consider the following entry from September 1581: “This morning after prayer I rode to westham payd my workmen

\textsuperscript{140} Folger 459, 71. For the significance and symbolism of hunting in early modern England, see Daniel Beaver, \textit{Hunting and the Politics of Violence before the English Civil War} (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008).
\textsuperscript{141} Scott-Warren, “Books,” 249.
\textsuperscript{142} Folger 459, 17.
\textsuperscript{143} Folger 459, 99.
ther went to estham to diner from thence to Duddingherst to Bedde.” 

Stonley’s land grabbing and his interest in renovation make him an active participant in the Great Rebuilding of England. Such ambitious and acquisitive images grate against those guarantors of a merchant’s faith, and they draw attention to the many uses and readings of this text.

The 1593-4 Journal

Richard Stonley used his 1593-4 journal in similar manner, as a collection of edifying textual notations, a record of finances, and a paper memory of daily life. Throughout these pages he continued to consider his writings as aspects of his credit. Yet his creditable image appears less pronounced in these works. (One wonders if the missing journals from the intervening years evince a similar trend.) This is perhaps because Stonley wrote this journal under heavy stress. It is worth remembering that, in the mid-1580s, Stonley’s accounts had faltered as Elizabeth I’s government pooled its resources for the war with Spain. In the late 1580s, Lord Treasurer Burghley had denied the teller’s access to Crown revenues. He had also quietly instructed him to get his affairs in order. Regardless of these events, Stonley’s second surviving journal initially offers little evidence of his troubles in Westminster. Instead of proffering a pious inscription, the heading of Stonley’s first entry reads, in an Italic hand, “Receptes and payments from the xiii\textsuperscript{th} of May 1593.” With the primary aim of the journal defined as such, his first entry announces the gift of a silver cup, worth thirty-two shillings, “to mistres Townley at the Christening of her child this day named Richard” as well as other gifts to the midwife

\footnote{144 Folger 459, 22v}

\footnote{145 For a nuanced discussion of the Great Rebuilding, see Lena Cowen Orlin’s chapter entitled “Rebuildings” in \textit{Locating Privacy in Tudor London} (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007).}
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This record of magnanimity is followed by the purchase of religious books. The final element of the entry appears thus: “this day after morning prayer I <went to Westminster kept there till xi came home to dyner> kept home and ther continued all the afternone with thanks to god at night.”

Here are several elements that were present in the prior journal. Stonley’s piety is still visible in the purchase of religious titles and the formulaic notice of daily prayer and thanksgiving. His generosity continues to figure prominently. Stonley mistakenly recorded the next day’s activities before replacing them with other comments. While this lack of accuracy detracts from the credit of the journals, it assures the reader of Stonley’s continued movement, indicating that he still journeyed west of the city walls to fulfill the duties of his office.

With the following entry, one witnesses further change and consistency. Under the heading for March 16, 1593, the teller’s reading selections—now more aptly termed florilegia, literally the “flowers of reading”—continue to express his commitment to moral improvement, though his reading material had changed. The humanist Richard Taverner’s translation of an Erasmian book of sayings lies parsed below the date. Stonley drew notes from this source throughout his second surviving journal. Food stuffs populate his record of receipts, and they appear often in itemized lists, continuing a theme.
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146 Folger 460, 3
147 Ibid.
148 Florilegia originated as a reference tool before or during the thirteenth century. These were the choicest selections of an authoritative source, which scribes compiled for memory’s sake. In Stonley’s case, his reading material—Richard Taverner’s Catonis disticha moralia ex castigatione D. Erasmi Roterodami...—was truly a preselected bouquet of florilegia in the form of Erasmus’s “pruning” of Cato’s sayings. For more on Florilegia, see chapter one of Ann Blair’s Too Much To Know: Managing Scholarly Information before the Modern Age (New Haven: Yale, 2010).
that began in the latter part of Stonley’s 1581-2 journal. Costs for stabling and “warfage” near Westminster Hall are present. Following his record of travel to that hammer-beam hall at the heart of Elizabethan government, Stonley noted two “strangers at dyner and supper mr heigham [and] Anne Tomlyn.”\textsuperscript{149} As the rest of this document reveals, Stonley’s standardized lists of mealtime “strangers” are a prominent feature of this journal.

Other aspects of this journal are consistent with the earlier text. Stonley’s concern for credit formation was still in effect as he engineered pious, generous, sociable, and otherwise reputable images of himself. During 1593, he spent twenty-nine pounds on his household staff and thirty-nine pounds on christening gifts.\textsuperscript{150} He remained an ardent supporter of his family’s legal and financial needs. He continued to reward servants and tender alms to the poor and needy. He remembered the queen’s birthday with a manicule and a prayer for her preservation “to gods pleasure and the comfort of all her loving subiects Amen.”\textsuperscript{151} He read assiduously—perhaps even more than his early journal admits—purchasing titles like “Harry Smythes book of the Synneres confession,” “Richard Hookers booke of the Lawes Eccliasticall” and “Thomas Belles book of motives.”\textsuperscript{152}

Stonley engaged in rituals of mutual exchange similar to those noted in his 1981-2 journal, which reinforced his relationship with those in his social sphere. Unlike in that journal, however, he jotted down a record of his New Year’s presents. From the house of

\textsuperscript{149} Folger 460, 3’.
\textsuperscript{150} Folger 460, 51’. Still, Stonley’s total expenses for apparel and servants’ wages in his 1593 account summary were noticeably less than his totals for the same categories in his prior journal. See Folger 460, 51’; Folger 459, 99’.
\textsuperscript{151} Folger 460, 40’.
\textsuperscript{152} Folger 460, 3’, 61’, 61’.
Richard Stonley, Lord Treasurer Burghley received a twenty-five-ounce bottle of “parfuming pame” valued at nine pounds. A similar gift found its way into the hands of Sir John Petre. To Vincent Skinner, Robert Petre’s replacement as writer of the tallies, the teller offered “a gilt bole with a cover,” which cost him almost four pounds. These gifts were calculated offerings. They placed Stonley into a bond of reciprocity with their recipients, and the latter were obliged to offer something in return. Given Stonley’s precarious stance in the exchequer, his gifts to Burghley and Skinner were likely aimed at maintaining his access to their good graces and cooperation.

Stonley received presents as well. These included fowl and other food gifts from his tenants. Felicity Heal has explored the manner in which these “customary boons” acted in similarly calculated ways to create or affirm bonds of obligation between landlord and tenant, master and servant. In this journal too Stonley evinced his participation within the network of mutuality that featured prominently early modern England. Yet this participation is somewhat lesser than before, given his conspicuous acts of quid pro quo. In his prior surviving work, Stonley sold land to Burghley from a position of privilege. Here, he attempted to trade favors in the spring of his discontent.

Other aspects of Stonley’s 1593-4 journal are comparable to the one that preceded it. Stonley’s acquisitiveness continues to shine through. The teller recorded that, during 1593, his household paid sixteen pounds for apparel, sixty-two pounds for food, and thirty-two pounds for wine. He continued to maintain several properties, noting

---

153 Folger 460, 53v.
154 See Felicity Heal, “Food Gifts,” 51. Heal argued that these kinds of gifts became more scarce as the seventeenth century progressed.
155 Folger 460, 51v.
payment for “the fine of a lease of a howse in la[m]beth marshe” in April 1594 and renovations of a chamber in Westminster a few months prior to this. Stonley also visited his manor in Duddinghurst; he supervised the harvest and the dredging of a moat. He copied these costs into his journal even while engaging in attempts to sell his other properties. This final point speaks to the ways in which the image of the teller diverges slightly from that displayed in the early 1580s.

Other changes appear throughout his 1593-4 writing. Stonley noted his trips to Westminster with less frequency. Burghley’s attempt at a moratorium on the teller’s access to state revenues is likely to blame here. This fact and the reality of Stonley’s advanced age—he was about seventy-three years old at this time—also proffer an explanation for the scarcity of remarks on the active handling of the queen’s money. Contrary to the impression given in Burghley’s 1588 letter, the beleaguered teller did continue to have limited access to this currency. In a November 1593 entry, he described receiving state monies throughout the day; that afternoon, a servant named Anne Tomlyn “carred the money to mr Skinners.” But no manicule marks this entry. Stonley’s middle journal also reveals that he borrowed £400 from a scrivener named Mr. Searcher in 1593. Loans were sought for a number of reasons and with great frequency in early modern England, and Stonley’s receipt for Searcher’s loan appears relatively innocuous since it was paid on time for less than the “usurious” rate of ten percent

\[\text{\textsuperscript{156} Folger 460, 38', 80'.} \]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{157} See page twenty-five above.} \]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{158} Folger 460, 40'.} \]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{159} Folger 460, 20'.} \]
interest.\textsuperscript{160} However, Stonley had no need of loans in 1581, when the queen’s money chests still sat at home. Following his initial dealings with Mr. Searcher, Stonley “\textit{Marked}” (with a manicule) that his “bill of the \textit{parcells} of plate remayneth in the box of .P. in the Gallary <under> and mr Serch hath the Bill of Sale under my hand and Seall.”\textsuperscript{161} These lines reveal the persistent intertextuality of Stonley’s writings. Perhaps they also reveal the boundaries of Stonley’s privacy. Does the deletion of the word “under” indicate that Stonley was about to reveal the location of his box of parcels, yet decided against it? The evidence here is ambiguous at best, yet one wonders at the possibilities.

This text diverges from its predecessor in other ways. Beginning in January 1594, Stonley set out to tally his daily “profit” and “losse” at the bottom of the page, yet he abandoned this exercise in double-entry bookkeeping a mere twenty days after its initiation, perhaps because of his embarrassing persistence in the red. Other whispers of debt echo throughout the journal. The teller indicated in early October 1593 that he “conferyd w\textit{i}th mr Skyner of my receptes payments and remayne \textit{w}i\textit{ch} were very Lowe.”\textsuperscript{162} A few days later he recorded sending “the state of my accompt to my L Treasrer at the cort.”\textsuperscript{163} In his entry for October 24, 1593, he wrote of meeting with Mr. Skinner again “to conferme w\textit{i}th hym touching my accomptes and to satisfy my L Treasrer\textit{es letters}.”\textsuperscript{164} Despite the potential for conflict with Burghley, the lord treasurer

\textsuperscript{161} Folger 460, 20\textsuperscript{r}.
\textsuperscript{162} Folger 460, 29\textsuperscript{r}.
\textsuperscript{163} Folger 460, 33\textsuperscript{r}.
\textsuperscript{164} Folger 460, 34\textsuperscript{r}.
still appears to have been one of Stonley’s allies and the teller was quick to judge him favorably in his journal. After noting a false rumor of the lord treasurer’s death, he offered “god kepe hym many yeres emonge us to the common weales sake.” Likewise, a few entries later Stonley ended a note on Burghley’s persistent supervision of his affairs with the observation that the lord treasurer was “yet a man [of] good nature and in thend showeth moch friendship to the honest mynded.”

While Stonley’s program of credit construction persisted in his 1593-4 journal, it contended with other images of the teller conjured by the journal’s practical uses—sometimes at the former’s expense. Stonley remained a pious man, a prodigious reader, a hospitable head of household, a good lord, and an accountant for various reasons. Yet the fact of his debts invades his middle volume, affecting minor changes in its form and tone. Still not everything makes sense in the context of this book. Between his entries for 1593 and 1594, Stonley casually sandwiched a record of plague deaths and christenings. This haphazard record speaks to the stark contingency of the volume’s utility.

The 1597-8 Journal

The fact of Stonley’s indebtedness to the queen shouts from the pages of his last extant journal, though it begins like his other surviving writings. The heading on the first page of the journal is familiar: “Recepts and payments from the xiiiijth of <Feburary> Marche 1596.” His journals’ long-running use as financial records remains intact. So does the presence of the proverb below, which derives from another work by Richard
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The journal’s humanistic overtones therefore also persist. The wording of the final component of the entry is unsurprising as well, beginning with the customarily pious “this day after morning prayer” and concluding with “so I ended that day with thanks to god.” An important divergence appears in the content of Stonley’s daily receipts, which list a payment of thirty shillings for “chambr rent” to “Iohn Hore the wardens clark of the flete.” Thus one finds Richard Stonley—now seventy-seven years old—paying his keep within “the prince of prisons” on London’s Fleet Street. This account features another interesting innovation. Below his charges for chamber rent, Stonley provided a subheading entitled “Dyner,” which includes “Butter: Herringe: Lunge: Haddock: Cold veall: Cold Capne.” A separate subheading for “Strangers” lists eight individuals, including unnamed servants. Similar details appear under headings for “Supper” and “Strangers.” So what appeared as an occasional note in the early pages of Stonley’s 1581-2 journal and became a regular part of the teller’s “diaristic” entries in his subsequent surviving journal, had developed into a fully standardized and independent component of his last work. These mealtime details continue to display the ex-teller’s liberality. Yet Stonley was not at home to host his “strangers.” His listing of “vittell flet” charges “for bred and drink” reveal that Elizabeth’s debtor took his meals in prison.

Consequently, though Stonley offered several complimentary images of himself in his

---

169 This was one of the editions of Richard Taverner, *The garden of wysdome*.
170 Folger 461, 1’.
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1597-8 journal, these displays are often confounded by the harsh reality of his circumstances.

Stonley’s situation could have been worse. In the sixteenth-century, Fleet Street Prison conveyed a number of amenities to its insolvent clientele, allowing access for friends of the prisoners and providing better, rentable lodging in an adjacent building. Stonley rented his room. By these standards the Fleet was “‘preferred before most other prisons.’” Even so, life there had its downsides. The prison sat beside the Fleet River, which acted as a repository for excrement, animal carcasses, and other odiferous waste. In April 1597, when Sir Thomas Shirley attempted to buy Richard Stonley out of his chamber, Stonley denied Shirley’s “farre reward” because he “was ther settlyd and in good Eyre towards the garden.” Stonley often wrote of wandering in the prison garden or watching the bowlers at play. After several months there, he received periods of “liberty” to travel abroad (for a price and under the supervision of a “keper”). Despite witnessing the occasional prison brawl, Stonley’s life at the Fleet appears rather decent in the context of his journal.

Other images are visible, though. The opening pages of the journal demonstrate that Stonley was no longer able to resolve his own legal matters. His incarceration forced him to rely on others to plead his case. He recorded his stepson’s efforts to carry “my
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175 Edward Hatton, qtd. in Brown, vii.
176 Folger 461, 10'. Stonley “manicules” the following statement beneath his entry for April 15, 1597: “And this evening the warden sent for me where agent read request for my Chamber for Sir Thomas Shurly but I denied yt concidering I was ther settlyd and in good Eyre towards the garden and after the saght of a farre reward I left them.”
177 Folger 461, 17', 15'.
peticons to my L Treasuror. “178 A few days later, he wrote of his two sons’ visit to the lord treasurer’s court to clear his debts.179 While Stonley’s own movements were restricted, he did leave his chamber on occasion. In early May 1597, Stonley was called to account for himself before the barons of the exchequer. Once there, Sir Edward Coke, the queen’s “hard-headed” attorney general, proceeded by “enveing sore agenst [me] and denying the allowance of all my peticons.”180 Stonley had to rely on family and friends to assist in the sale of his properties, which the Crown demanded for restitution. His sons worked to drum up buyers when he could not travel “abowt the sale of my land.”181 He regularly met with buyers in prison. Stonley wrote in April 1597, “this day came to me Sir John Petr and D[aniel] Donne to preced for the sale of my land but we cold not conclude at that time.”182 As this line reveals, the process of selling Stonley’s possessions was fraught with decelerating forces. One buyer threatened him and his wife over the sale of his land.183

These images are vastly different than those that appear in his first journal. Though he worked to mitigate this impression, Stonley was no longer a man of credit. He engaged in social connections as an unequal partner. He doled out comparatively paltry sums of money to maintain a minimum of comfort. Though probably in part the result of his advanced age, Stonley’s movements in the execution of the rights of his office and the tending of his properties had become largely relegated to the prison grounds, and other men worked to ameliorate his condition. Stonley required a supervisor during any (paid)
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excursion beyond the prison. In these ways, the selves that emerge from Richard Stonley’s three diaries are not static, congruent entities. They change according to location and circumstance.

Neither are they fully incongruent. Stonley’s difficulties are apparent throughout his last surviving journal, but the ex-teller made a visible effort to project a positive, if somewhat defensive, self-image. He fashioned himself a victim. Discussing his treatment in the court of the barons of the exchequer, Stonley remarked with exasperation that while “mr cook […] know the Law yet in this matter he understand not the course of the xchequer.” He also wrote of sending letters of his “pore estate” to the lord treasurer. He lamented the case of “my pore wyf.” When his wife fell ill in the summer of 1597, Stonley recorded this jeremiad: “god helpe hir and send us some comfert yf yt be his will – for yf my service were conciderd as yt ought to be or yf hir maiestie knew yt I shuld be otherwise conciderd to my owne comfort and my frendes et cetera.” Stonley’s reading selections reinforce his victimhood. In July 1597, he indicated, “this day after service in the chappel I kept my chamber reading the Lamentaciouns of Jeramya.” In these small and subtle ways, Stonley imbued his last existing journal with tones of frustration and dejection that are absent from his earlier works.

Not everything changed in Stonley’s final journal. This work nearly always shows the ex-teller with a book in his hands. Though the author allowed others to inventory and sell his possessions, he continued to feed this appetite with the purchase of “massettes

\[184\] Folger 461, 17v.
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\[188\] Folger 461, 39r.
book of the proverbs” and “the book of jack of Newberye” in June 1597. He copied *florilegia* from the works of Erasmus. Still, while Stonley was regularly “occupied […] at my books” throughout the volume, this phrase assumes new significances according to its context. It no longer connotes the practice of a cultured gentleman reading in the comfort of home but that of a cultured prisoner, who had little else to do with his time under guard at the Fleet. In addition to books, Stonley continued to buy other goods and services—bread, wine, legal assistance, apparel, and the like. He maintained a certain level of charity. Consider the following entry, which mentions Stonley’s gift of several shillings, “to the pore woman at the flete for a month kepeing the spere chambr.” He continued to use his journal to track news and other points of interest.

In his final surviving journal, Stonley exhibited a pious persona, molding this image around his church attendance, participation in the Eucharist, and scripture reading. He scribbled those familiar phrases “this morning after preyer” and “with thankes to god at night.” Still, these phrases did not necessarily convey the same meaning for the author over the course of Stonley’s writings. He wrote them in his earlier journals during periods of relative joy, wealth, power, and prestige; here, these phrases were borne out of melancholy, insolvency, powerlessness, and ignobility. He composed them within the confinement of his stinking Fleet Street chamber, surrounded by ruder sorts of men. His dissimilar circumstances and spaces imbued these moving lines—as they imbued the man who authored them—with shifting connotations.

The “ideal form” of Stonley’s introduction to his diaristic entries also underwent an important, yet subtle change in his final journal. According to daily reminiscences in
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prior journals, he had often kept “home,” a word that could denote his properties in London, Duddinghurst, Estham, and elsewhere. He used the phrase “I kept home” so much that these three words are almost reflexive components of his opening sentence structure: “This morning after prayer I kept home […]” In his final surviving journal, however, Stonley “kept my chamber.” This was not his home. This point finds emphasis in the five separate occasions in which Stonley succumbed to reflex, penning in his prison journal “this morning after prayer I kept <home>” only to strike through the final word and replace it with “my chamber.”\(^{191}\) This conscious removal of the word “home” from Stonley’s final journal adds a shade of melancholy to the text that its essentially “ideal” format elides. In the summer of his discontent, Stonley was no longer at home; his current space fostered a change in his habitual modes of introduction.

Attending these changes was a significant transformation in the utility of Stonley’s final journal. On June 29, 1597, the ex-teller recorded a notice (complete with manicule) that he had shifted his accounts of the day’s expenses and record of mealtime guests to “another booke wich I terme the weekbok or kytchin book wherein I wrîtte all thinges and somes of money leyd owt and all kind of weyes what ys spent besides of provicion what presente and what strangers resort to me that in the end of the yere I may pye owt evere thing in ther proper places.”\(^{192}\) Curiously, F. G. Emmison has noted that “two kitchen books (or ‘week books’)” remain among the papers of Sir William Petre, suggesting that other moderately-sized, sixteenth-century homes employed this specific kind of record as well.\(^{193}\) The remaining two-thirds of Stonley’s last volume contains
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only reading notes, “diaristic” entries, and the occasional “Flete” charge. Hence it is difficult to sustain the argument that Stonley’s journals evince an unbroken focus on appraising his material and cultural effects, side by side. After a certain point, the former disappeared from his writings and the latter shrank to the dimensions of a prison chamber. Beyond June 29, his journal served a denuded purpose, as a record of readings and daily observations with minimal import for the construction of credit.

A few pages before the switch, Stonley also opened his final journal to outside hands for the first time. In April 1597, the warden’s deputy, John Hore, signed to certify Stonley’s payment of his biweekly chamber rent. He continued to do so through the remainder of the journal. In March 1598, the prisoner’s fortnight rent and seven days “liberty” abroad in the city were “Recorded by me Christopher Bryan.” In May 1598, the signature of a third person appears in the ex-teller’s records. This individual inscribed his receipt into Stonley’s journal with his own hand. His angular secretary script reads thus:

\[
\text{“Recorded of Mr Stonley for one weekes chamber rent ended the sixth of maye 1598 \quad \text{xv\scriptstyle v}\}} \\
\text{Tho. Phillips}\]

Though Stonley’s journals were surely never “private” records, the opening of this text to “strangers” is a notable development. The bills that Hore, Bryan, and Phillips signed show that Stonley’s final writing no longer functioned as a “journal,” narrowly defined as a middle point in the organization of financial records. It was now closer to a “memorial,” in which one recorded bills as they occurred. Yet after June 29, even this
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was a peculiar kind of memorial, acting as the repository for a single kind of bill—the prisoner’s charge. Unlike the preceding journals, Stonley no longer used this text as evidence of his engagement within a network of mutual exchange insured by the reliability of credit relations. Stonley’s location—debtor’s prison—and his jailers’ engrossed signatures on his payment for lodging and liberty attenuate the need for the charade of credit. This observation underscores the fact that while Richard Stonley may have crafted his final journal to fashion himself as the longsuffering victim, his interest in using it to enhance whatever remained of his credit appears weak at best.

Over the course of this chapter, the applications of and images contained within the journals of Richard Stonley have undergone a clear transformation, which correspond to the teller’s changing fortunes and settings in the waning years of the Tudor fin de siècle. Stonley’s 1581-2 journal acted as a means of credit construction while serving a variety of other practical purposes within a context of privilege and plenty. As Stonley’s fortunes changed, so did the tone and format of his second surviving journal. Though this work is quite comparable to the earlier journal, it shows Stonley as a man whose cash resources had run dry and whose privileges had diminished. Stonley paid greater attention to the presence of guests within his household throughout this volume, even if he continued to use it much the same as before. The final surviving journal of Elizabeth’s embezzling teller finds the author a “victim” to Elizabethan court politics. During his time at the Fleet, Stonley essentially demoted this work from “journal” to “memorial,” and he no longer seems to have employed it as a means of credit construction. Instead, it acted solely as a record of reading notes and “daily” observations. In these ways, the changing textures of Stonley’s personal life infused his manuscript writings with a variety
of functions, forms, and meanings beyond the considerations of credit and outside the early modern culture of appraisal.
CHAPTER IV

“KEPT AT MY BOOKS ALL THE AFTERNONE”: READING IN STONLEY’S JOURNALS

Richard Stonley used his journals for moral and mental development, which had “creditable” overtones. A principle mode of this development appears in his reading notes, located below nearly every dated heading in each of Stonley’s existing works. The previous chapter has claimed as much. Still Stonley’s records of reading deserve further analysis. This need is clear given that, while scholars have discussed the content of the teller’s library and appraised the books in his accounts, none have considered how Stonley actually read these titles. This has not been for lack of evidence. The teller’s notes reveal a great deal about how he read. During the last two decades, students of early modern books have approached similar records to discern how individual readers used and interpreted their books. An investigation into Stonley’s reading would complement the scholarship of this field by proffering a look at the idiosyncratic reading habits of an understudied sixteenth-century English bibliophile. For this reason, a separate chapter on Stonley’s reading notes is warranted.

This chapter begins with a digression. I argue that Stonley’s reading notes are “liminal” compositions, located between narrow definitions and only indirectly connected with other aspects of his journals. Following this, I investigate how Stonley moved lines from his books into his journals. This section shows that the queens’ moneyman regularly
summarized and condensed his reading material. Yet Stonley often copied the words of ancient authors verbatim. According to the journals that we know about, Stonley read particular texts intensively. In his final journal, however, he used his favorite texts to supplement an extensive program of reading. This last journal also shows that Stonley seems to have edited his notes out of a concern for manufacturing a positive self-image. As before, the emphasis in this chapter falls on the change and consistency of Richard Stonley’s reading habits over the course of his serial texts and their dissimilar contexts.

The “Liminality” of Stonley’s Reading Notes

In many ways, Stonley’s reading notes offer a thread of consistency within the tapestry of his journals. They appear below nearly all of his dated entries, spanning from a single line to a half page. Elizabeth’s embezzler organized his notes in similar patterns over the course of his writings. Consequently, the liminality of these textual excerpts persists with relative consistency throughout each journal. Stonley’s notes were liminal for two reasons. First—and quite unsurprisingly—they occupy the space between proper definitions. From a certain angle, these notes have the properties of commonplaces, which are themselves notoriously difficult to define. While Peter Beal has written of the classic commonplace book as an “educational aid” containing adages selected through reading or listening and ordered below thematic headings, Earle Havens has noted the “immense constitutional diversity” of commonplace books that intersect with and diverge from this basic structure.197 Adam Smyth has opted for “the more capacious” descriptor

---

“‘common book culture,’” which he has found to exhibit no less than sixteen characteristics. Like Beal, Smyth also views the impulse to order textual fragments “according to thematic consistencies” to be an essential aspect of this culture.\textsuperscript{198}

Stonley’s reading notes are not arranged according to any perceptible theme. They do, however, contain interrelated, often aphoristic content discriminately selected from classical or biblical sources and arranged for personal edification and enjoyment. They are all but true \textit{loci communi}—sayings gathered below “common places.” Since they are located on the threshold of this particular definition, they wear other titles uneasily. One can hardly think of these notes as miscellanies, given that they were always acquired in sequence from a single cohesive source. As I have suggested elsewhere, the engineering of strict boundaries around literary forms is anachronistic when applied to the early modern era. Perhaps, then, it is best to see Stonley’s reading notes as the iteration of another educational aid borne of an aphoristic culture.

Stonley’s reading excerpts are liminal in another sense too. They have little in common with the other components of his journals. A relationship is often visible between the other two parts of Stonley’s “daily” entries—his records of finance and activity. For instance, it is easy to pair a bill for the purchase of “vittell” with a list of Stonley’s dinner guests. No such correlation exists when it comes to his reading notes. These lines were not contingent on daily events. He selected them according to the order of a given text, and for this reason, they were mostly unrelated to the other content. This is not to say that this act of note-taking had no relevance for the other parts of Stonley’s

\textsuperscript{198} Smyth, 127-129.
journals. As chapter three has shown, Stonley’s textual snippets often reinforced his creditable image when that task was a central concern.

Lines Removed

Stonley took his notes from books that made sententious sayings easily available. In his first journal, he read the Bible. The teller began his 1581-2 text by copying a few verses from the Psalms under each dated heading. He wrote them in an italic hand, which sixteenth-century writers typically employed for special texts. In fact, throughout the rest of his journals, Stonley used only this hand when recording the words of classical or Biblical authors. The exchequer official started his first surviving journal with Psalm 136:4-5, writing the successive lines over the course of the following pages. The sixth and last verse of Psalm 150 appears beneath his heading for November 14, 1581.

Still Stonley copied more than the Psalms during the early months of his earliest journal. When his Bible offered chapter summaries and clarifying notes in the margins, he wrote these down too, switching to the secretary hand—a script for everyday business, which he used to record nearly everything else in his journals. In his entry for July 6, 1581, Stonley transferred Psalm 137:9, which reads ominously, “blessed shall he be that taketh and dasheth thy children against the stones.”199 The Bible or Bibles that Stonley used included a marginal notation explaining that this verse alluded to a prophesy of Isaiah. Stonley passed over it.200 This kind of “pruning” occurs sporadically throughout the journal, even while Stonley continued to transcribe much of the commentary.

199 In what follows, I compare Stonley’s 1581-2 reading notes with a 1578 copy of the Geneva Bible. All other editions of this particular text that I’ve seen exhibit the same chapter summaries and marginal notations. See The Bible. Translated according to the Ebrew and Greeke..., trans. and ed. William Whittingham, et al. (London: 1578).
200 Folger 459, 7".
It is unsurprising that Stonley recorded glosses in his reading notes. He probably came to appreciate the humanistic practice of annotating through his education—though one would be hard-pressed to label Stonley a “humanist” in an honest sense of the word. Still, his inclusion of chapter glosses alongside the verses in his reading notes shows that Stonley read not simply to stoke the fires of religious devotion but also to digest the text, to remember its contents in sum. Stonley’s reading notes in his earliest surviving journal were thus both an exercise in piety and a means of broadening his knowledge base.

Upon concluding the Psalms in mid-November 1581, Stonley switched to recording only the chapter summaries for the following books of the Old Testament and Apocrypha. Hence, during the remainder of his 1581-2 journal, perhaps the teller’s thirst for the acquisition of information overcame his interest in the source’s details. Yet why did he copy the Psalms verse by verse? His use of the Italic hand signals his special reverence for these scriptures, which have a certain lyrical quality. If his appreciation for this quality compelled him to copy the Psalms outright, then his reading notes were more than an exercise in moral and intellectual development. They had literary utility. Such an observation underscores the idea that implicit within any text is the potential to foster a great variety of readings.

---

Of course, scholars from Burckhardt to Baron to Kristeller and beyond have offered different interpretations of humanism. My own interpretation owes a great deal to Paul Oskar Kristeller and his students, who insist that Renaissance humanism was little more than a dynamic literary and cultural enterprise rooted in the studia humanitatis and harboring the “intention to imitate ancient Latin style.” According to this standard, Stonley was much more like a student of the humanities a la Ramus than a humanist proper. For the quotation above, see Ronald G. Witt, ‘In the Footsteps of the Ancients’ The Origins of Humanism from Lovato to Bruni (Boston: Brill, 2000), 22.
Throughout the rest of Stonley’s 1581-2 journal, he condensed and summarized Old Testament prophets in a practiced secretary script. His note for December 4, 1581, reveals how he did so. In this entry, Stonley reproduced the text’s summary of Proverbs 10. It follows essentially verbatim from the Geneva Bible: “In this chapter and all that follow unto the thirtieth, the wise man exhorteth by diverse sentences which he calleth parables to followe vertue and flee vice and showeth also what profite commeth of wisdom and what hindrance proceedeth of foolishness.”202 In the left margin beside this notation, Stonley wrote, “The next chapter is the xxxth bycause this treatith of all the other.”203 For Elizabeth’s senior teller, this marginal note was a sufficient compendium of the next twenty chapters. With “too much to know” already at hand, Stonley was content to read his Bible in brief.204

Stonley’s 1593-4 journal contains slightly different reading material. As before, the notes in this volume derive from a single book. This book was the work of a man who would become a perennial favorite of the teller. Perhaps like Stonley himself, Richard Taverner favored the middle ground between Pope and Puritan. Probably born about 1505 in Brisley, Norfolk, Taverner was an active promoter of church reform under Cromwell. He nonetheless knew how to be moderate. His revision of John Roger’s 1537 Matthew Bible tempered the latter’s rampantly anti-papal translation and fostered, in the
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204 Ann Blair’s Too Much To Know: Managing Scholarly Information before the Modern Age (New Haven: Yale, 2010), asserts that Renaissance readers often felt inundated with information in the course of a certain “info lust.” Many responded to this anxiety by using and adapting medieval tools for reference. Perhaps a similar info lust drove Stonley to read as he did; perhaps the impression of “too much to know” caused him to condense his notes.
words of J.K. McConica, a “change in tone from a distinctly Protestant work to a
moderate and characteristically Erasmian compromise.” Taverner was an
accomplished student of Erasmus. He did a great deal to popularize the famed humanist’s
writings in England, compiling Erasmus’s translations of ancient authors into a series of
texts published during the final decade of Henry VIII’s reign. Richard Stonley read
Taverner’s edition of the Latin sayings of “Cato the Censor,” pruned by Erasmus, along
with the proverbs of Publius and others in his 1593-4 journal. He recorded it adage by
adage in an italica hand along with Taverner’s English-language glosses, which he wrote
in secretary script. As before, he condensed the commentary. For illustration, Taverner’s
gloss of book four, verse thirty-four of the Disticha reads,

To the intent thou mdest be the better beloved of men, see though bee rather the
more thanckfull and kinde towards men, winnyng their harte with workes and
offices of humanitie, least thou doe els run into the name, which of the Latine
people was called officiperda, that is to saie, as some men interprete it, one upon
whom, a good tourney bestowed is loste, or as other thinketh, a destroier of and
loser of all good humanitie.

Stonley’s notes are shorter:

That thow mayst be the better beloeved of men be the more thanckfull towards
men winnyng ther harte with worke and office of humanitie lest els thou rune in
the name that the Latines call oficiperda or as some interpret yt one upon whom a
good turne ys lost or a destroyer or loser of all humanitie.

While Stonley abbreviated Taverner’s glosses, he copied the Latin adages verbatim.

Hence, just as before, Stonley’s reading notes served a variety of uses, as a commerce
with the classics, a learning endeavor, and a means of ensuring a high “appraisal” of his cultural and creditable worth.

Stonley’s final surviving journal finds him making his way through another of Taverner’s writings. In his preface to *The Garden of Wysdome*, Taverner judges his work “a paradise […] of nette, propre, quicke, and grave sayinges of renowned persons, in which to recreate your selfes.” Stonley recreated himself by copying sayings from the *Garden* in a similar manner as before. He transcribed this book into his own a few lines at time, and he did so while shortening Taverner’s commentaries. In his entry for March 21, 1597, Stonley recorded an anecdote from the life of Solon in which the sage considered how the “leeste wronge myghte be done amonges men.” Solon acknowledged that the least wrong would occur “yf […] they that suffer nat the wronge wyl be so sore greved therwith, as they hat suffred it in dede.” Taverner extends Solon’s quotation for several lines, but Stonley did not record them. Interestingly, the lines that the ex-teller overlooked indicate that those who “transgresseth the lawes” commit an injustice that affects the commonwealth at large. For this reason, the “good laws of good prynces” must inveigh against all offenders indiscriminately. Stonley may have pruned this quote in an effort to condense a long excerpt. However, he recorded extensive quotations in other parts of his final journal. Since Solon’s denunciation of criminal activity would have appeared in the context of Stonley’s debt crisis, perhaps he deliberately excluded it to avoid the association.
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Other evidence in the ex-teller’s final journal supports this claim. In mid-April 1597, below an entry in which Stonley described his efforts to sell property and petition the court, he skipped over a story of moderate length by Alfonsus of Aragon about a “certayne knyghte” who had “wasted all his patrimony and lands whiche were very greate, and moreover had indetted himself excedyngly moche.”213 In its place, he recorded the following anecdote—a more anodyne statement about the importance of studying “all kynde of letters.”214 It appears innocuously beside his sons’ visit to the “L Treasurer” where they were advised to “bring the offers of the land more plainly.”215

Other reading notes in Stonley’s last journal reveal a shift in the way he abridged his texts. Stonley referred future readers to back to the text when the wisdom of the ancients became too expansive. Below his entry for April 25, 1597, his notes on the life of Athanasius—which Taverner describes for several pages—conclude after a few lines with the inscription, “read the history at large in Taverners garden of wisdome.”216 When the story of Sigismund the Emperor ran too long, Stonley ceased to copy it halfway through with the instruction “rede the Story and how [Sigismund’s servant] was discoved with the boxe of leade.”217 These are the words of a man who—at least for the moment—intended his reading notes to act as a reference guide, rather than a collection of memorable phrases.

After finishing Taverner’s *Garden of Wysdome*, Stonley proceeded to a Latin edition of Erasmus’s *Adages* with an English commentary. This was also the work of
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Richard Taverner. As per usual, Stonley recorded the proverb in italic script sparing none of its parts, and he abbreviated the commentary in secretary script, sometimes inscribing a reminder to “see the adages.” Here, Stonley’s reading notes took on another dimension, prompting their reader to find books mentioned in Taverner’s glosses. When the English Erasmian commented on another of his idol’s works, Stonley wrote “Reade the Institucion of hollydayes with Erasmus opinion of [its] Abuse.” Likewise, he made a note to “rede the fable of Mars and Vulcan,” when Taverner referenced it a few pages later. And when the author discussed the story of the lion, the ass, and the fox in a subsequent entry, Stonley added it to his reading list as well. In these lines, I find evidence of Stonley’s extensive reading habits as well as a shift in the way he used his reading notes. Within his Fleet Street apartment, his notes had become points of reference for further reading even as they functioned to condense a pithy text as a memory aid.

Stonley also began to cross-reference readings in his last surviving journal. In his notes for October 9, 1597, he compared Erasmus’s quotation about the rewards of cowardice with “the Adege for [page] .42.” writing also “ther is a nother proverb but not so clenly viz. [i.e. apparent] a falce hart never kepyd feyre lady.” Below a mid-November excerpt which reads “Finem vitae specta: marke thende of th[y] lyf,” Stonley recorded a similar Welsh proverb, which Taverner’s commentary does not mention. Thus in his last journal, Stonley evinces a greater desire to use his notes for reference

219 Folger 461, 57r; Erasmus, *Proverbs or adagies*, 59v–60r.
220 Folger 461, 57v; Erasmus, *Proverbs or adagies*, 60v–60r.
221 Folger 461, 48r; Erasmus, *Proverbs or adagies*, 40v.
222 Folger 461, 53r; compare with Erasmus, *Proverbs or adagies*, 50v.
purposes than he had so far revealed. It is tempting to link this change to Stonley’s annexation of bills from the latter two-thirds of his journal. Were the two related?

Toward the end of his final writing, Richard Stonley finished copying Erasmus’s *Adages*, and he returned to an old favorite. This was Richard Taverner’s edition of the *Disticha*. He began in the middle of the book, skipping Cato’s proverbs for a section of “Wise Sayings Collected from Various Writers by one Disiderius Erasmus of Roterdam […].” The ex-teller’s notes here offer no indication that he found the meaning of this text to be any different than before. Stonley copied the proverbs in the same pattern that his 1593-4 journal displays, recording the ancients line by line and condensing wordy commentaries. The fact that Stonley returned to an old text reveals a penchant for intensive reading, which is juxtaposed against his earlier interest in noting further books to know. Stonley’s final journal shows him at his most dynamic. He appears as both an intensive and extensive reader; his notes have expanded to include a notice about related texts. These are the changes that underlie the apparent consistency that the pattern of his reading notes convey.

Overall, Richard Stonley’s journals display a “great variety” of readings. In his earliest surviving work, the way that Stonley read his Bible changed over time. Though he began by copying the lyrical Psalms verse by verse, he digested what followed in brief. Throughout his second journal, he pruned Taverner’s commentaries while savoring the sayings of the ancients in full. In his final extant writing, he used his notes to record and reference other interesting works even while he condensed the text’s glosses and
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223 Richard Taverner, ed., *Catonis disticha moralia ex castigation D. Erasmi Roderodami…* (London: 1562). In Latin, the first lines of this title read, “aliquot sententiarum flores ex varius collecti scriptoribus per Deside. Erasmus Roterdamum, una […]”
sampled its proverbs. As with Fred Schurink’s three Renaissance readers, Stonley’s reading—particularly in his earliest journal—reveals a scholarly, utilitarian approach to the text alongside one with literary dimensions.224 Stonley read differently within different texts. Still he also took the same notes on the same texts more than once, and he assimilated books by abridging the commentaries and transcribing the original authors in full. These observations reveal that, while Stonley’s ownership of books contributed to his cultural and social capital, they had a number of further uses, which intersected with the changing and consistent needs of personal, social, and material life.

CHAPTER V

“FOR A PYNT OF BLACK INCK PURE”: THE MATERIALS OF SELF COMPOSITION

About February 6, 1594, Richard Stonley bought a few items from a London bookseller, likely on that same stinking street that he would occupy as a prisoner three years later. The day’s entry records the purchase of “red inck” and “blacke ink pure” with a “book of Motives” by Thomas Bells. Two pints of pure “inck” cost the teller twelve pence. Ink was an essential element within Stonley’s compositional process. As such, the inky lines contained within his journals can also function as important descriptors of that compositional method for those who are curious about the mechanics of writing in early modern England. Ink offers an occasional window into the teller’s habits of writing with a kind of precision that anecdotal evidence can hardly provide. Changes in its character can proffer insight into the locations of inscription, the times and dates of writing, and the characteristics of the hand it binds in iron. These are important points of investigation for students of English textual culture, and they are a few of the points that the present section will consider.

This final chapter engages the journals of Richard Stonley on a further plane of analysis, investigating the materiality of the text—the objects and instruments it encompassed and the appearance of the work itself. In particular it considers what ink
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225 Folger 460, 61".
patterns can tell us about how Stonley actually wrote his journals. In doing so, it helps to diminish a continuing dearth of scholarship on the early modern writing process. Before tracing lines of ink in Stonley’s journals, this chapter describes a few of the objects that Stonley used to write. After reviewing instruments and ink lines, it briefly probes other features of his journals, their curious ownership, and the physical marks that both have left behind. Overall, the following lines show that the apparent consistency which Stonley’s journals assume at face value is often rendered false according to the physical nature of their inscription. In certain portions of his text, one can glimpse that process of textual transmission, which Richard Stonley employed for his own credit and vindication, yet which stretches beyond him, even into the twenty-first century.

The “Penne” and Its Associates

Richard Stonley used several conventional materials to compose his three surviving journals. One of these was a quill. During the early modern era, the quill was ideally the feather of a domestic goose, being “white, rounded, unflecked, transparent and with little fat selected from the third or fourth feather of the wing or pinion.”226 Writers trimmed the stub end of this utensil with a long, thin steel knife, using a minimum of seven cuts to fashion the quill’s nib “like the top of a hawk[ ’s] beak.”227 They placed a final slit down the point of the nib to control the flow of ink onto the writing surface. Harold Love has indicated that the shaping of the nib was “a tricky operation.”228 Pen

226 Anthoni G. Petti has indicated that quills might alternatively be made from the “the feathers of a swan and raven, with vulture preferred for large script, and crow for fine or very small work.” See Petti, English Literary Hands from Chaucer to Dryden (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1977), 7.
228 Love, 107.
men and women who were unable or unwilling to trim their own nibs could buy their quills in bulk, pre-cut by a professional. Stonley probably cut most of his own quills, given that he listed the purchase of “two penknyvs” in his final journal. It is not difficult to track the application of different or newly trimmed quills throughout Stonley’s writings, according to the thickness of the script, which the shape of the nib determined. The follow section incorporates this kind of analysis.

Ink is another component of Stonley’s journals. While different recipes abounded in early modern Europe, there were generally two basic methods of making ink. The first employed a form of carbon (e.g. charcoal or lampblack) mixed with gum and water. The second necessitated tannin-rich oak galls (i.e. “round excrescences produced by the gall-fly on branches of oak trees”), iron sulfate, gum, and water. While the first concoction—a quite ancient recipe—produced a deep black ink, it failed to form a strong bond with the writing surface. Easy to rub off, this ink lost prominence during the early modern era to iron gall ink, which reacted chemically with the page to form a lasting and potentially corrosive inscription. “Careful writers,” Love has indicated, “would manufacture their own ink.” And many people who used the second potion had their own particular recipe for success. Stonley used iron gall ink in his journals, but he sometimes left his potion making to others, as the introduction to this chapter shows. Like the shape of the nib, the color of the ink tells its own story about the way that Stonley wrote. Because the fashioning of ink in early modern Europe lacked standardization, a given pot of ink could differ from any other according to its
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230 Petti, 7.
231 Love, 105.
composition. For instance, iron gall ink containing high ratios of gum (typically gum arabic), which maintains the inky iron-tannin compound in suspension and binds it to a substrate, often exhibits a darker color than ink with lower gum content. The ratio of tannic acid to iron salts also affects color. More of the former tends to produce blacker tones, while an increase in the latter is often associated with browner hues. The character of ink can also change over time. After standing for several days in an inkpot, it undergoes the process of oxidation, which results in the precipitation of particles of pigment within the liquid, diminishing its writing properties. The document itself sometimes plays a role in the ink’s appearance. Early modern paper could also vary in its composition, so its capacity to neutralize the acid of an ink mixture could change from page to page. These observations point to the fact that difference in the character of ink within a serialized, early modern manuscript document often implies a difference in composition.

Paper is an aspect of Stonley’s journals that also requires consideration. Paper became popular during the early modern era as a less bulky, less expensive alternative to parchment. Paper makers fashioned their product from a soup of old rags, which they pressed into a mold and hung to dry. The English were only beginning to tackle this new manufacture in quantity by the time that Stonley placed quill to paper, though they gained
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232 I am grateful to Dr. Vincent Daniels for his clarifying comments regarding the chemistry of iron gall ink. See also his article, entitled “The Chemistry of Iron Gall Ink,” in The Iron Gall Ink Meeting: 4th and 5th September 2000, the University of Northumbria, Newcastle upon Tyne: Postprints, eds. A. Jean and E. Brown (Newcastle upon Tyne: Conservation of Fine Art, School of Humanities, the University of Northumbria, 2001): 31-35; David Dorning, “Iron Gall Inks: Variations on a Theme That Can Be Both Ironic and Galling,” in The Iron Gall Ink Meeting: 4th and 5th September 2000, the University of Northumbria, Newcastle upon Tyne: Postprints, eds. A. Jean and E. Brown (Newcastle upon Tyne: Conservation of Fine Art, School of Humanities, the University of Northumbria, 2001): 7-11.
little market share during the sixteenth century in proportion to the craftier and cheaper foreign imports. The paper books that Stonley acquired for his journals were likely foreign in origin. So too were the “two reme of divers paper” he bought for eleven shillings in 1581, and the “browne paper” he purchased in 1597.

Stonley employed other materials in the composition of his journals. In his first, he copied a bill of four pence for “pyndust.” “Pin-dust” was often composed of brass filings or certain kinds of powder. It acted as a blotting mechanism before the development of blotting paper. Peter Beal has acknowledged its utility for English scribes in the seventeenth century. Charges for sand, another source of blotting, also appear in Stonley’s journals. In May 1582 Stonley also listed a receipt for “two rewlers,” a common piece of scribal paraphernalia.

At multiple times, Stonley listed the purchase of “writing tables” and “pennes.” As Peter Stallybrass and others have recently shown, writing tables were a kind of “erasable notebook.” To make them, printers coated “pasteboard” (e.g. a piece of parchment or paper) with layers of gesso and glue, which hardened into a “sleeked,” inflexible surface. To use them, writers applied the sharpened end of a “pen” (i.e. a silver, brass, or copper stylus resembling the shape of a “pin”) to the hardened surface.
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233 I have yet to link the watermarks that each journal exhibits—“z,” “KK,” and “OO,” respectively—with their shops of origin.
234 Folger 459, 33'; Folger 461, 23'.
235 Folger 459, 23'.
236 OED s.v. “Pin-dust.”
237 Beal, 13.
238 Folger 459, 42'; Folger 460, 40', 81'.
239 Folger 459, 59'.
240 Folger 459, 10', 73'; Folger 460, 41', 78'.
242 Ibid., 387.
etching “‘a thin deposit’” of the metal onto the prepared paper, which “rapidly tarnishe[d] in the air to leave a pale grey line.” Authors could erase this line by applying a wet cloth to the table. Incidentally, London printers had just begun producing writing tables during the early 1580s. They often sold them to men of commerce. Stonley likely used them to facilitate the movement of data from one collection point to another. So it is probable that some of the information he collected in these tables made its way into his journals.

Stonley wrote intertextually. Chapter three has already revealed that the teller utilized his journals in tandem with bills in the box, books of accompt, sermon notes, kitchen books, and a “book of charges in lawe.” While he employed writing tables to transmit information, he also used other texts to do so. He owned almanacs, which typically contained blank spaces for notes alongside a list of dates, saints’ days, weather predictions, lunar cycles, or other miscellanea. In December 1581, the teller purchased “vij Almanacks” valued at eight pence. The fact that he bought seven at one time implies that their utility was not simply calendrical. Perhaps Stonley and his servants used these copies as a kind of “memorial” for notes and transactions that eventually made their way into his journals. Adam Smyth has recently discussed how almanacs acted as conduits for the transmission of information into life-writings. In the process, the order of these texts framed their successors. Thus Smyth has claimed, “Many features of diaries can be explained through reference to the almanac as a first or early site where notes on a life were marked out.” One looks with interest therefore at the regular recording of

243 Ibid., 407.
244 Folger 459, 36’.
245 Smyth, 35.
246 Smyth, 38.
saints’ days in the headings of Stonley’s second and third extant writings. These saints are mostly absent from his earliest known journal. Arguably, Stonley’s almanacs acted as further links in a chain of textual transmission, and he eventually used their lists of saints to shape the format of his journal entries. In this way too, subtle yet important changes in the way that Stonley composed his journals hedge against any vision of their ideal nature.

Follow the Ink

Reviewing these instruments of composition helps to frame an analysis of how Stonley wrote his journals. By cross-referencing the color and character of the script in these texts with his records of movement, it becomes apparent that the teller often wrote parts of multiple “daily” entries on a single day. Consider a spate of entries in his 1581-2 journal. Under the August 1, 1582 heading, Stonley recorded a short summary of the third chapter of Micah in brownish ink and drew a line beneath it (see Figure 5.1). Below the line, in the same brown ink, he wrote of his visit “with mr Ienyns touching a marriag matter.” Following this he “came Back to London kept home all the afternone with thanks to god at night.”²⁴⁷ He continued to copy the next heading for Thursday, August 2, in brownish tones. Next he offered a summary of Micah chapter four and drew another line. Below this line, Stonley inscribed—this time in black ink—a note on his travel “to Duddingherst to bed with thankes […]”²⁴⁸ He composed his August 3 heading and the next summary in this same black ink. The teller’s writing instruments changed according to his physical space, revealing details about his writing habits. In the section outlined above, the pattern of ink in Stonley’s earliest journal shows that he often began his “daily” entries not with the dated heading, but with the record of the previous day’s

²⁴⁷ Folger 459, 69‘.
²⁴⁸ Ibid.
events. Essentially he wrote his “daily” entries from line to line rather than from heading to heading as one might expect, starting with a review of yesterday’s events and ending with his reading notes for the present day.

Still Stonley’s habits of writing fluctuated over time and across space. After his entry for August 3, the teller remained at Duddinghurst and continued to author his records in black. In his diaristic entry for August 8, the author’s script turns brown with a note reading “This morning after preyer I rode to London to bedde with thankes to god for that dayes travel” (see Figure 5.2). As one might expect, the change in color signals
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Stonley’s return to his London writing desk. On August 10, Stonley’s ink once again turns black, showing that he revisited Duddinghurst. The wording of the entry tells a different story. Under his heading for this date, Stonley continued to write about his activities in London as if he were still there. His visit to Duddinghurst appears in the next day’s narrative. In this case, the curious ink trail in Stonley’s earliest journal reveals that he did not necessarily write daily entries on a daily basis. He wrote them at his convenience, when the opportunity arose; when the appropriate scribal paraphernalia was at hand; when the books he copied were available; and when his bills and other financial records were accessible. Stonley’s journals often required these preconditions, and their absence could influence his habits of composition. For modern readers, the variability of
Stonley’s writing habits undermines the regularity that his entries assume at face value. For early modern writers, these habits were entirely conventional.

The black ink of Duddinghurst and the brownish hues of Aldersgate Street continue to reveal Stonley’s modes of composition over the following pages. The teller sometimes waited several days before recording a slew of entries. His writings for September 10 through September 12 demonstrate as much. The black ink in these entries shows that Stonley waited at least three days after his departure from London to write them. He likely did this while using a network of other texts—bills in the box, writing tables, almanacs, etc.—to capture information as it developed. For the modern reader, these realizations hedge against any notion of Stonley’s writings as pure, unadorned daily compositions.

Ink in Stonley’s journals reveals not only movement but its opposite as well. When a sickness rendered the teller immobile in 1581, his ink remained the same over the period of his illness—though the character of Stonley’s script changes according to the cut of his quill. Likewise, there appears to be no clearly identifiable patterns of change in the color of the ink that Stonley applied to the pages of his subsequent journals. Does this imply a shift in Stonley’s habits of composition, perhaps involving the use of those almanacs mentioned above? One can only speculate at the possibilities. If the mostly blackish hues of Stonley’s latter journals indicate a set place of composition, then his journals contain lines of both movement and immobility.
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250 Folger 459, 74v-75v.
251 Folger 459, 48r-54r. It’s notable that on 48r the hue of Stonley’s London ink changes from bluish black to brown. Does this imply a new pot of ink?
Attention to the ink patterns in Stonley’s works has other uses. It shows that the
teller interpolated text into his entries. In the margin beside his record for September 16,
1593, he recorded a manicule and a notice of Sr. Robert Petre’s passing using a lighter
shade of ink than that of the entry itself.\textsuperscript{252}\ These examples are but a few of many, and they
demonstrate the multiple inscription points of Richard Stonley’s texts. These writings
were not simply written and discarded. The queen’s embezzling teller reread his journals,
filling out his “daily” entries over an extended period of time. In doing so, he has
confounded modern notions of authenticity that are often associated with self-written
manuscripts.

Textual analysis confirms the impressions sketched above. That Stonley wrote
his dated entries over multiple days is apparent in his record for January 16, 1598. Under
this heading, Stonley related his hourly battle with a “shakinge” illness.\textsuperscript{254} The sickness
started at eleven o’clock on the morning of the sixteenth. Stonley went to bed sick at
seven o’clock in the evening, and he slept until eleven o’clock at night. He recorded that
from twelve o’clock until four o’clock the next morning (i.e. the morning of the
seventeenth) he began to shake again. After “some slumbring” he rose at seven o’clock
and “[s]o endid that day and night with thankes to gode.”\textsuperscript{255} Stonley clearly wrote his
diaristic entry for January 16 on the morning of January 17. That he wrote multiple

\textsuperscript{252} Folger 460, 27\textsuperscript{r}.
\textsuperscript{253} Folger 459, 26\textsuperscript{v}.
\textsuperscript{254} Folger 461, 61\textsuperscript{v}.
\textsuperscript{255} Ibid.
entries on the same day is also evident in his notes for May 16-17, 1594. Under the heading of the former, Stonley recorded the latter date’s events only to scribble them out, fill in the “correct” information, and re-record the excised material under the following day’s heading. Similar mistakes pepper each of his surviving journals. In sum, they combine to underscore the depth of the variation inherent in a putatively invariable series of texts.

Further Features of the Text

Lena Cowen Orlin has recently demonstrated the extent to which modern attitudes toward privacy are not applicable within the culture of Tudor London. It was often more important for Londoners to demonstrate transparency than to find privacy in its various forms, as the latter could insinuate sinful activity. Given their conspicuous points of self-fashioning, Stonley’s journals were likely prepared with the potential for a select audience in mind. They were not willfully private texts. As noted in chapter three, moreover, Stonley eventually opened his final journal to outside hands. Still the wording and function of Stonley’s journals are not the only considerations that make it difficult to envision them as private documents. The journals’ physical appearance offers this impression as well.

256 Folger 460, 84-85.
257 The meaning and nature of privacy is a hotly contested issue within early modern English historiography. Recently, for instance, James Daybell has affirmed a growing perception of letters as personal, private artifacts over the course of the early modern era. In affirming Orlin’s helpful attempt to historicize privacy, I don’t intend to signal that the idea and reality of privacy was transforming into a central concern of English society during the era in question. I only assert that, in spite of whatever transformation was occurring, privacy was not necessarily a “desirable and progressive” good for many early modern Englanders. See Orlin, 9.
258 Orlin, 1-15.
The calculated presence of certain lines imply that Stonley’s writings anticipated other readers. As financial accounts, they were beholden to a system of cultural signals that determined the veracity of their content. Stonley’s use of white space was particularly important. Ceri Sullivan has found several writers of early modern handbooks who strongly condemned the appearance of open spaces and insertions in financial accounts.259 One instructed his readers to cross out blank spaces so as to keep the integrity of the ledger intact. Given that financial notes often had legal currency, the injunction against tampering with the texts—or providing the room to do so—was a serious matter. Each of Stonley’s journals display the use of slanted lines to cover up white spaces. These marks usually appear at the bottom of the page in the space below a completed entry.

However, Stonley did strike through and add to the information in his journals—a fact that highlights their contingent nature. He (or someone else) used vertical lines and x-marks to cross out the marginal notes in his records for 1582. Jason Scott-Warren has seen this as a “transparent” act of editing, which rendered the discarded text still readable to retain the appearance of truthfulness.260 Beyond this, a multitude of other correction marks appear throughout Stonley’s surviving journals. He often wrote words and phrases out of order in his reading notes, only to cross through them or note his mistake in the margins.261 Stonley also fudged his accounts. In September 1582 entry, he crossed out a bill for apparel with a series of x-marks.262 He slashed through another for carpentry

259 Sullivan, 32.
260 I am grateful to Dr. Scott-Warren for his comments concerning this aspect of Stonley’s texts.
261 A small, representative sample of such instances appears in Folger 459, 46’, 54’, 75’, 85”; Folger 460, 13’, 71’.
262 Folger 459, 75’.
work in 1594. These are two of many examples. As the previous section has revealed, the Tudor teller altered his “dairistic” accounts with noticeable regularity. Stonley’s doctoring sometimes left the original text indecipherable; on the other hand, portions of white space remained untouched in each of the journals. Consequently, Stonley’s journals are suffused with lines of credit as well as their opposite. While the former speaks to way that these journals participated in a cultural program of credit construction, the latter points to the contingent, serial nature of the text.

The subtle marks that underscore the friction and flow of purpose and utility in Stonley’s journals become more complicated in light of the fact that these works have lived for centuries beyond the life of their earliest owner. As a result, they have accumulated further marks, additions, and deletions from subsequent owners. They have also garnered new significances in the hands of others. It is unclear what happened to Stonley’s journals immediately following his demise in 1600. They likely passed to his children. Whatever the case, it seems that Stonley’s writings were eventually scattered among multiple owners. Their chain of transmission remains fraught with questions marks until the late-eighteenth century, when three of the teller’s journals trickled into the possession of Francis Douce.

Douce was an antiquarian and collector with a special interest in the life and times of William Shakespeare. In 1807, his interests led him to publish a two-volume work entitled Illustrations of Shakespeare, and of Ancient Manners. At least a decade prior to this, Douce had received at least the 1593-4 Stonley journal. According to his book of
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notes on the teller’s surviving manuscripts, he did acquire the other two, though not necessarily at the same time. Douce noted his discovery of Stonley’s bill for “Venus and Adhonay per Shakspere” in a 1794 letter to fellow antiquarian and Shakespeare scholar George Steevens. Steevens in turn passed the information along to Edmond Malone, who included a citation about an “ancient MS. Diary” containing a June 1593 bill for the Bard’s play in his 1795 Inquiry into the Authenticity of Certain Papers and Instruments Attributed to Shakespeare [...].

Francis Douce was likely not the individual who penciled in page numbers on the rectos of each of Stonley’s surviving journals, but he did reproduce its contents in his own handwritten manuscript. Following Douce’s death in 1834, his voluminous collection of antique books and other materials were donated to the Bodleian Library. Stonley’s three journals were not among them. Now notable for their association with the great English playwright, these journals found another home in the library of a well-known London surgeon named John Adair Hawkins. Hawkins, who gained membership in the Society of Antiquaries of London in 1792, owned a second folio edition of the collected works of William Shakespeare among a variety of other collectible tomes. The antiquarian added his bookplate (and perhaps extra endpaper) to Stonley’s famed 1593-4 journal sometime before passing away in 1842.
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265 Bodleian MS Douce d. 44, 91, reveals that the 1593-4 Stonley journal “fell into” Douce’s hands after his acquisition of the other two.
266 Folger MS C.b. 10, no. 66. This citation contains the letter from Francis Douce to George Steevens (7 May 1794).
268 See Bodleian MS Douce d. 44., 69-104.
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At this point in their transmission, Stonley’s three journals may have transferred through Hawkins’s last will and testament into his wife’s ownership and, thereafter, his children’s inheritance. Or they may have been conducted via another route to their next documented owner, William S. Niven, who likely purchased the three journals during the waning years of the nineteenth century from bookseller James Rimell and Son. An avid antiquarian and book collector, Niven died in 1920, yet a bookplate bearing the name of his private library remains pasted to the endpage of Stonley’s first surviving journal, along with a catalogue notice of sale by Rimell and Son booksellers.

It is unclear what happened to the Stonley journals in the decades following Niven’s death. In the 1950s, California bookseller William P. Wreden found the manuscripts in London and purchased them for his own collection, where they silently remained for the next two decades. Subsequently, in 1971, Wreden presented the journals to an acquisitions librarian from the Folger Shakespeare Library during a regional book fair, and shortly thereafter, the books were shipped to Washington. Once there, Folger researchers rediscovered the Shakespearian reference located on the ninth recto of the middle notebook. Press releases hailing the discovery as one of the most important Shakespeare finds in recent years found their way into dozens of major newspapers, and the journals were donated into the Folger’s collections in 1972. They remain there today, bearing the marks of a circuitous provenance and assuming an importance that Stonley could hardly have imagined during a trip to a London bookstall on the eve of summer, 1593.
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Attention to the physical transmission of Stonley’s journals reveals that these works bear multiple significances not simply for their initial owner, but also for a series of successive owners, who prized the works as pieces of history or windows into the lost years of Shakespeare’s life. Attention to the material construction of these writings furthermore reveals that the putative “pattern” of Stonley’s daily entries—the day’s date, followed by a commonplace, a line, a list of expenses, and a note on the day’s activities—elides a great deal of variation in his practices of composition. It shows that the queen’s moneyman wrote his “daily” entries in many ways, complicating any perception of these texts as systematic efforts in credit creation. In sum, the contingencies and spatial contexts of these writings provide ulterior visions of the nature and images of Stonley’s texts. This rumination on the physical properties of the text bears an important lesson for students of serial writings in early modern England, as it reaffirms the need to situate these works as expressions of metamorphosis, articles of a life however diligently or haphazardly marked. Any assumption of the text’s static uniformity has the potential to obscure the depth of significance that the writing yields. In this sense, this examination of Stonley’s materials of composition—their moving lines, especially—and the physical transmission of his journals adds dimension to a set of manuscripts that display the textures of life in Tudor London and beyond.
CHAPTER VI
CONCLUSION

In a vindication of the use of microhistory, Kevin Sharpe once argued that effective case studies allow us to “see an episode or moment as a point on a number of contours, a point which constitutes different meanings according to the territory or relief under study.”\(^{273}\) The present study has attempted to view the journals of Richard Stonley in a similar manner, as texts with multiple meanings in light of the varied dimensions of the life of their primary author, his places and materials of writing, his intentions and concerns, and his successes and failures. These works have no single purpose, use, standard of composition, or order; rather, they are marked by a multiplicity of such features. Overall, the preceding lines have indicated that Elizabeth’s embezzling teller used his texts in different ways—as financial records imbued with creditable features, as a storage medium for “liminal” commonplaces, as a repository for “daily” observations, “national” news, mealtime memorials, godly gossip, and a host of other considerations. These aims shifted over time, and in turn, they produced a multiplicity of selves in flux. These multiple images and the metamorphic text that produces them run contrary to any single vision of Stonley’s journals. In making this observation, the present work has seized on an opportunity to explore a relatively understudied figure and to extend a burgeoning area of discourse.

\(^{273}\) Sharpe, 62.
In addition to considering the uses and images of Stonley’s journals, this thesis has probed the content of his commonplaces. These “liminal” entries have no easy definition. They reveal a figure who engaged in a variety of different reading practices, extensive and intense, edifying and enjoyable. These notes were broadly important within Stonley’s project of self-fashioning, and he was sensitive enough toward this concern to occasionally edit his commonplaces to suit his self-image. And even if the nature and aim of his records of reading retain a consistent sense of ambiguity, Stonley’s mode of note taking underwent a slight shift toward the end of his life, with notes serving as points of reference to an increasing extent. Therefore, while Stonley’s books may have functioned as a means of increasing his cultural capital, they also acted practically, as a mode of mental and moral improvement as well as aesthetic delight.

Lastly, this thesis has provided an analysis of ink lines in the journals of Richard Stonley—lines which shifted and moved with Stonley’s changing locations and materials. The material nature of Stonley’s journals at once heightens and hedges against their creditable overtones. The physical transmission of these works over time has imbued them with significance beyond that which their earliest author initially perceived. In these various ways, the preceding work has placed the journals of Richard Stonley within the textures of a personal, social, and material life, rendering up the anthropology of a manuscript and the portrait of a man of remarkable interest.
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