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NOTES

INTRODUCTION


4. For the most influential discussions of when and how the modern self emerged, see Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980); Charles Taylor, *Sources of the Self: The Making of Modern Identity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989); Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, trans. Thomas Burger (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1989); Watt, *Rise of the Novel*; Macpherson, *Political Theory*; Michael McKeon, *The Origins of the English Novel, 1600–1740* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987); Wahrman, *Making of Modern Self*; Deidre Shauna Lynch, *The Economy of Character: Novels, Market Culture, and the Business of Inner Meaning* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988); and Richard Sennett, *The Fall of Public Man* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1974, 1976). Scholars of eighteenth-century literature and of the novel in particular (Watt, Macpherson, McKeon, Lynch, Wahrman) have acknowledged that although the sources of the self (to borrow Taylor’s phrase) may have emerged during the early modern period, familiar technologies of the private self (such as the realist novel and the secular autobiography as genres that emphasize the self as coherent and psychologically developed) emerged sometime between 1660 and 1800. I don’t wish to reiterate these arguments here. I begin this study with Cibber because he was the first to compose a secular autobiography in English. (I define a secular autobiography as one read for its subject’s individual qualities and experiences rather than his or her relationship to a religious collective, and structured as a coherent narrative rather than a conversion tale meant to emphasize the subject’s distance from his or her former, sinful self.) I conclude with Mary Robinson both because her autobiography marks a somewhat dramatic departure from Cibber’s style and because the most influential studies of autobiography suggest that, whatever the sources of the self, the conception of the self and of autobiography changed with the rise of romanticism and the publication of more psychological works like Rousseau’s *Confessions* and Wordsworth’s *Prelude*. See Roy

5. I am deliberately echoing Jody Greene’s language in *The Trouble with Ownership: Literary Property and Authorial Liability in England, 1660–1730* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005), in which she analyzes the predicament faced by modern authors, including Pope, writing after the passage of the Statute of Anne in 1710. As Greene notes, the Statute established writers (rather than printers) as the proprietors of their books and the recipients of the royalties those books generated. While this development allowed authors to claim ownership of their own works, it also made them liable to censorship and libel laws as they had never been before.


9. The suggestion of sincerity is what distinguishes overexpression from similar terms like “persona” or “camp.” Unlike a persona, an overexpressed identity is never mistaken for a mask concealing identity but always appears—at first—to reveal identity. (For a discussion of the difference between the persona and the “true” character—or what appears to be true character, see Philip Auslander, *Performing Glam Rock: Gender and Theatricality in Popular Music* [Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2006], 4–5.) Unlike camp, similarly, overexpression never betrays outright irony or deliberate artifice. Essential to overexpression is the spectator’s confusion over what aspects of the performance constitute the performer’s sincere


12. Stuart Sherman has written a fascinating account of Garrick’s interest in controlling his images in the newspapers of his day; see Sherman, “Garrick among Media: The ‘Now Performer’ Navigates the News,” *PMLA* 126.4 (October 2011): 966–982.


15. This second definition is one invented not in the age of Enlightenment but rather in the electronic age, in which it has come to mean “to destroy (data) by entering new data in its place”—a definition that the *OED* dates to 1951. Nonetheless, the word has always carried the meaning of an excess of writing that results in an exhaustion or a depletion of writing: in 1752, according to the *OED*, Cibber’s contemporary Samuel Richardson used it to mean “to exhaust oneself or diminish one’s abilities by excessive writing.” *Oxford English Dictionary Online*, s.v. “overwrite.”


17. Peggy Phelan, “Just Want to Say: Performance and Literature, Jackson and Poirier,” *PMLA* 125 (2010): 946. In my desire to combine theater history and performance studies I am influenced by a number of scholars working in the field today (including Lisa Freeman Joseph Roach, Felicity Nussbaum, Misty Anderson, Stuart Sherman, and Emily Hodgson Anderson). I am influenced as well by three recent books of theater historiography that have explored both the advantages and the impossibilities of reconceiving theater history as a history of performance practices as well as scripts and stage directions: Thomas Postlewait’s *Cambridge Introduction*


23. Ibid., 5.

24. Ibid., 5, 25.

25. I borrow the term “spectacular politicians” from Paula Backscheider’s influential work of the same name, Spectacular Politics: Theatrical Power and Mass Culture in Early Modern England (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993), which examines the implications in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries of models of leadership explored elsewhere by Stephen Orgel, Stephen Greenblatt, and Peter Stallybrass and Allon White. “Public representatives” is Jürgen Habermas’s term for the spectacular noblemen, noblewomen, and religious figures who controlled society before the structural transformation of the public sphere in the late seventeenth century.


28. Habermas’s account has drawn criticism for being overly general and for not considering significant portions of the European population (women, sexual minorities, ethnic or racial minorities) in its definition of what constitutes a “public.” (For a helpful summary of the major schools of such criticism, see Craig Calhoun’s introduction to Habermas and the Public Sphere, ed. Calhoun [Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1992].) While I do not consider Habermas’s definition of the public sphere to be all-encompassing, I do find his theories useful in thinking through what eighteenth-century England required for entry into the normative public sphere.


30. Pope, Temple of Fame, 1. 361.


33. Ibid., 17.


37. Shearer West writes, “Journalistic criticism, the print trade and the market for oil paintings all burgeoned in the mid-18th century, just at the time when Garrick was raising the status of the actor and elevating acting to a place beside the other liberal arts. Between 1730 and 1750 a trickle of theatrical reviewing in journals became a flood.” West, *The Image of the Actor: Verbal and Visual Representation in the Age of Garrick and Kemble* (London: Pinter, 1991), 2. Paul D. Cannan comes to a similar conclusion in *The Emergence of Dramatic Criticism in England: From Jonson to Pope* (New York: Palgrave, 2006).


41. Ibid.

42. Ibid., 7.

43. The *OED* defines “smear” as “fat, grease, or lard”—all substances removed from the interior of the body (*OED Online*, s.v. “smear”).


**CHAPTER 1**

1. There is some question about whether the play debuted in December 1699 or in January 1700. W. van Lennep, E. L. Avery, A. H. Scouten, G. W. Stone, and


5. Feminist critics such as Nussbaum (*Autobiographical Subject*), Sidonie Smith (*A Poetics of Women’s Autobiography: Marginality and the Fictions of Self-Representation* [Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987]), and Phelan (*Unmarked*) have been perhaps most influential in describing autobiography in this way.

8. Ibid., 21.
12. Ibid., 24.
20. Ibid., 49.
26. Ibid.
29. The term “scripts of disability” originates with Carrie Sandahl and Philip Auslander, who use it to describe the disabled person struggling “to become an active maker of meaning, rather than a passive specimen on display. Manipulating and transforming stereotypes are important tactics, since the available ‘scripts’ of disability—both in daily life and in representation—are frustratingly limited and deeply entrenched in the cultural imagination.” Sandahl and Auslander, “Introduction: Disability Studies in Commotion with Performance Studies,” in *Bodies in Commotion: Disability and Performance*, ed. Carrie Sandahl and Philip Auslander (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2005), 3. Though Richard III does not figure specifically into Sandahl and Auslander’s argument, this character has served as the basis for many disability scholars’ work on literary portrayals of the “Demonic Cripple,” in Leonard Kriegel’s words, who, “like Shakespeare’s crippled king, . . . must now spend his remaining life resisting categorization. His existence is predicated on the need to become what he believes the world demands he become.” Kriegel, “The Cripple in Literature,” in *Images of the Disabled, Disabling Images*, ed. Alan Gartner and Tom Joe (New York: Praeger, 1987), 34.
32. Lennard J. Davis explains that the category of normality emerged in the eighteenth century, as did the exclusion of the disabled body from this category. Davis, *Bending Over Backwards: Disability, Dismodernism, and Other Difficult Positions* (New York: New York University Press, 2002).
36. Ibid., 10.
39. Ibid., 15, 16, 16.
40. Ibid., 16.
41. Ibid., 17.
42. Shakespeare, *Henry the Sixth*, 5.6.31–84.
44. Cibber, *Richard III*, 78.
45. Ibid., 79.
46. The *OED* lists the use of this reflexive pronoun as signaling the individual’s return to a “normal condition of mind and body.” *OED Online*, 3rd ed., s.v. “himself.”
49. Ibid., 5.7.13.
50. Ibid., 5.8.2.
52. Ibid.
53. Though the first four lines of Richard’s death speech are original to Cibber, these last he lifts from the first scene of Shakespeare’s *Second Part of Henry IV* (1.1.155–160). Cibber did not compose the words about “the first-born Cain,” then, but his co-opting of them in a different context and in reference to a different character betrays an interest in the metaphor that seems to go beyond the disabled body that Richard shares with Northumberland, to whom Shakespeare assigns these lines.
59. Ibid., 83.
60. Porter, “Foreword,” xviii.
sounded like before the advent of sound recording is impossible, though several scholars have tried to approximate it.

64. Cibber, Apology, 33–34.


66. T. Johnson, The Tryal of Colley Cibber, Comedian (London: W. Lewis and E. Curll, 1740), 13. This essay is reprinted (with some deletions) in Fielding’s periodical The Champion, in the issue dated May 17, 1740. Accompanying it is a damnation of the earlier pamphlet as an unauthorized reprinting. Given Fielding’s and his fellow Scriblerians’ interest in pseudonyms and in-jokes about the impossibility of claiming any literary work as one’s property, however, the damnation is probably facetious. Fielding, The Champion (May 17, 1740), in Contributions to “The Champion” and Related Writings, ed. W. B. Coley (Oxford: Clarendon, 2003), 423–425.

67. Cibber, Apology, 34.


69. Ibid., 9–10.

70. Addison, Spectator 69, 256.

71. Laureat, 75.

72. Ibid., 35.

73. Johnson, Tryal, 11.


75. Pope, Dunciad in Four Books, 4.9–14.

76. Pope, Dunciad, 711. Helene Koon identifies the true author of this introduction as Pope’s friend William Warburton. Koon, Colley Cibber: A Biography (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1986), 164. John Butt, however, suggests that Pope had a hand in many of Warburton’s annotations. Pope, Dunciad, 710 n. 1. Cibber himself notes that “Pope is so apt to put his own Praises into the Mouth of a fictitious Author, that we cannot be sure whom we are to thank for the Modest Performance” (Another Occasional Letter from Mr. Cibber to Mr. Pope [London, 1743], 20). Cibber applies the quote specifically to the “Preface” that precedes Aristrachus’s introduction and that is explicitly attributed to Warburton, but his words also cast doubt on the authorship of the introduction that follows. Whether or not Pope composed the introduction, its statements reflect the overexpressive qualities that he attributes to Cibber’s prose throughout the rest of the poem.

77. Pope, Dunciad in Four Books, 712.

78. Ibid., 3.268.

79. Ibid., 767 n. 20.
80. Cibber, Apology, 24
81. Pope, Dunciad in Four Books, 713.
82. Ibid., 711.
85. Pope, Dunciad in Four Books, 713.
86. Ibid.
87. Ibid.
88. Ibid., 714, 715.
89. Ibid., 713.
90. Ibid., 714.
92. Laureat, n.p. This description of the mock-epic’s distortions of scale survives even in discussions of the genre by today’s critics, like Helen Deutsch, who writes that while Pope’s earlier mock-epic The Rape of the Lock “preserves totality in miniature, that distorted fragment of Parnassus, the Dunciad, by its magnifying of contemporary detail into life-size scale, abandons coherent epic wholes for grotesque satiric remnants.” Deutsch, Resemblance and Disgrace: Alexander Pope and the Deformation of Culture (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996), 176.
95. Pope, Dunciad in Four Books, 1.1–3.
96. This top-heavy couplet does not appear, significantly, in the 1729 Dunciad Variorum, which does not feature Cibber as hero. The earlier version begins with an image similar to that which begins The Dunciad in Four Books, but it uses a different syntax that places the third possible rhyme, “sing,” within the first line of the initial couplet: “Books and the Man I sing, the first who brings / The Smithfield Muses to the Ear of Kings.” Pope, The Dunciad Variorium, in Poems of Alexander Pope, A.1.1–2. Coming to the “sing” before (s)he arrives at “brings” or “Kings,” the reader doesn’t recognize it as a rhyme, and thus the effect is lost. Both Hunter and Wimsatt mention the similarly top-heavy rhyme that begins Pope’s Rape of the Lock as
emphasizing the “barren superfluity” of the mock-epic form, though neither they nor Deutsch discusses the *Dunciad*'s opening couplet directly.

98. Ibid., 4.251.
99. Ibid., 713.
100. Ibid., 718.
101. Ibid., 767 n. 20.
102. Ibid., 4.653–656.

CHAPTER 2


Women and Performance in Eighteenth-Century England, ed. Laura Engel [Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars, 2009]) arguing that it is a performance designed to expose all gender as performative.


4. Ibid., 95.


6. Wahrman, *Making of Modern Self*, 18. Wahrman’s argument that gender and sexuality became essential qualities of selfhood in the eighteenth century is not a new one and, indeed, has been central to eighteenth-century studies since Michel Foucault’s historicization of gender in *The History of Sexuality*; his theories of spectatorship and self-policing more generally might also be gleaned from his *Discipline and Punish*. Other influential contributions to this field have been made by Thomas Laqueur, Randolph Trumbach, and Laurence Senelick.

7. Laureat, 1–2.


10. Lynn Festa, “Personal Effects: Wigs and Possessive Individualism in the Long Eighteenth Century,” *Eighteenth-Century Life* 29.2 (2005): 83. Also noteworthy is a special issue of *Eighteenth-Century Studies* on “hair.” Margaret K. Powell and Joseph Roach’s article in that issue, “Big Hair,” has been especially useful in discussing Cibber’s wig in particular and eighteenth-century hair in general as a social performance.


14. Ibid., 55.


18. The similarities between Brett’s character and Cibber’s sentimental heroes is striking: in another episode from the *Apology*, Cibber describes his offer to exchange his own clean shirt for Brett’s dirty one in order to facilitate Brett’s pursuit of his future wife, an episode that recalls Loveless’s statement that he has “baulk’d many a Woman in my Time for want of clean Shirt.” Cibber, *Apology*, 204–205. Helene Koon cites a rumor that the Steinkirk scene in *The Careless Husband* was based on an interaction between Brett and his wife, but she doubts its truth. Koon, *Colley Cibber*, 48.


21. Ibid., 1488.
23. Ibid., 22.
26. Despite Cibber’s circumspection, at least some of the autobiography’s readers seem to have recognized its benefactor: in his 1968 edition of the autobiography, B. R. S. Fone identifies Cibber’s “certain gentleman” as “Henry Pelham (1695–1754), brother of Cibber’s friend, the Duke of Newcastle, and in 1743, prime minister.” Fone, introduction to An Apology for the Life of Colley Cibber, ed. Fone (Mineola, NY: Dover, 1968), 327 n. 1. Nonetheless, Cibber’s insistence on withholding his patron’s name invites endless jeers from his critics. In the 1740 parody billed as an autobiography of Cibber’s son, Theophilus, the author (probably Henry Fielding) repeats Cibber’s refusal to name his patron but portrays it as yet another example of Cibber’s kowtowing to a benefactor whose identity was hardly a secret to Cibber’s readers. Fielding, An Apology for the Life of Mr. The’ Cibber, vi–viii. The jest returns again in the front matter of An Apology for the Life of Mrs. Shamela Andrews, a sexualized sendup of Samuel Richardson’s Pamela that has been definitively identified as Fielding’s work but which its title page attributes to “Mr. Conny Keyber,” a bastardization of Cibber’s name. The parody begins with a congratulatory letter written from “The Editor to Himself.” Fielding, An Apology for the Life of Mrs. Shamela Andrews, in Joseph Andrews and Shamela, ed. Judith Hawley (London: Penguin, 1999), 7. Charke begins her Narrative with a famous and flattering dedication from “The Author to Herself” (iii–ix), which Sidonie Smith has read as an acknowledgment of the autobiographer’s double identity as both the subject and the author of her life. Charke, iii–ix; Smith, Poetics of Women’s Autobiography, 103–104. Perhaps more prosaically, I consider Charke’s dedication to be a reference to the work of her friend Fielding as well as another coded gesture toward her father.
27. Cibber, Apology, 1.
28. Ibid., 3.
29. Laureat, 7.
31. Ibid., 3.
33. Cibber, Apology, 3.
34. Laureat, 2.
35. Ibid., 1–2.
36. Ibid., 2.
37. Ibid., 15.
39. In “The Unaccountable Wife and Other Tales of Female Desire in Jane Bark-
er’s A Patchwork Screen for the Ladies,” Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation 35.2 (Summer 1994): 155–172, Kathryn R. King speculates, “It is possible that the term ‘unaccountable’ in the early eighteenth century is a coded word” for lesbianism, as it seems to be in the Barker text that King discusses (172). However, the only other instance she cites for the code is Charke’s Narrative, in which, as I argue, the autobiographer’s sexuality is somewhat more ambiguous. I quote the word here not as evidence that Charke was a lesbian but instead as evidence that she preferred to leave her gender and sexuality undefinable and unaccounted for. See also Katherine Binhammer, “Accounting for the Unaccountable: Lesbianism and the History of Sexuality in Eighteenth-Century Britain,” Literature Compass 7.1 (January 2010): 1–15.

40. Charke, Narrative, 56.
41. Ibid., 56–57.
42. Ibid., 59.
43. Ibid., 90.


45. Charke, Narrative, 95.
46. Ibid., 82.
47. Ibid.
48. Ibid., 207.

49. Morgan, The Well-Known Troublemaker, 142n.

51. Cibber’s particular misspelling is also interesting. “Paraphonalia” reinforces Cibber’s preference for language grounded in performance over print, phonic over standardized spellings, the individuated Harse over the depersonalized horse.

52. Fielding, Author’s Farce, 1818.
53. Morgan, The Well-Known Troublemaker, 143n; Cibber and Vanbrugh, Provoked Husband, 58.

54. The relationship that Fielding establishes between Cibber’s deformed language and an overtly performed (and thus suspect) sexuality is evident as well in Fielding’s use of the word “vartue” in Shamela. Such deformed language is also evident in the barely legible letter written as an expression of love from Loveman, the
queered molly who propositions the hero Henry Dumont, in Charke’s novel *The History of Henry Dumont*.


57. Ibid., 18.

58. Straub, *Sexual Suspects*, 136. Other critics to describe the passage as an example of Charke’s struggle to express herself in language that is necessarily sexist and heteronormative include Erin Mackie (“Desperate Measures”), Felicity Nussbaum (*Autobiographical Subject*), Sidonie Smith (*Poetics of Women’s Autobiography*) and Cheryl Wanko (*Roles of Authority*).


60. Marjorie Garber describes transvestitism as a “third term” that is neither masculine nor feminine but simply Other. Often, she argues, this Otherness is represented as a racial Otherness. Garber, *Vested Interests: Cross-Dressing and Cultural Anxiety* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 304–352. Although I see a similar Othering happening in Charke’s description, I wish to distinguish it from the queer theory on which Garber bases her argument by suggesting that it originates not from the inadequacy but rather (like Sterne’s black page) from the abundance and obviousness of identifying signifiers.


**CHAPTER 3**


2. Ibid., 242; Keymer, *Sterne*, 155.


4. Ibid., 181.

5. Stevens, *Celebrated Lecture on Heads* (Dublin, 1765), 56.


10. Sterne, Works, 155.

11. For all biographical information on Sterne, I am indebted to Arthur H. Cash’s two-volume biography. Ross’s Laurence Sterne: A Life focuses more specifically on Sterne’s literary career and has been invaluable in detailing Sterne’s public persona and life as a celebrity.


13. Ibid., 261.


15. After Sterne’s death, the books in his library were combined with those of several of his neighbors’ libraries, making it impossible to separate which books were his and which belonged to his neighbors. However, as Arthur H. Cash points out, a note on the flyleaf of a volume containing both Cibber’s Letter to Mr. Pope and Bishop Berkeley’s Querist marks it as belonging to Sterne. Cash, Laurence Sterne: The Early and Middle Years (London: Methuen, 1975), 199.

16. These include George Stayley’s 1762 Life and Opinions of an Actor, which Rene Bosch (Labyrinth of Digressions: “Tristram Shandy” as Perceived and Influenced by Sterne’s Early Imitators [Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2007]), discusses on pages 49–50; as well as George Anne Bellamy’s An Apology for the Life of George Anne Bellamy (1785) and Tate Wilkinson’s Memoirs of His Own Life (1790) and The Wandering Patentee; or a History of the Yorkshire Theatres (1795).

17. A Supplement to the Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gent., Serving to Elucidate That Work (London, 1760), in Eighteenth-Century Collections Online, 71. The allusions include a story about Tristram’s bullying at the hands of his schoolfellows and his adoption of the “school-boy’s stile,” a possible evocation of Cibber’s complaint in the Apology that, after completing an assignment that his classmates refused, “I was so jeer’d, laugh’d at, and hated as a pragmatical Bastard (School-boys Language) who had betray’d the whole Form, that scarce any of ‘em wou’d keep me company.” Supplement, 64; Cibber, Apology, 22.


21. Ibid., 25.

22. Ibid., 22.


25. Ibid., 28.


27. Ibid., 257.

28. Ibid., 57.

29. Ibid., 227.
35. Sterne, Tristram Shandy, 65.
36. Ibid., 65–66.
37. Ibid., 67.
38. Cibber, Apology, 7.
40. Ibid., 28.
41. Ibid., 16.
43. Miss C——Y’s Cabinet of Curiosities; Or, the Green-Room Broke Open. By Tristram Shandy, Gentleman (Utopia: Whirligig’s, 1765), 21.
44. Sterne, Works, 144.
45. Ibid., 154.
46. Samuel Johnson, “Preface” to A Dictionary of the English Language (1755),
47. Ibid., 310.
50. Ibid., 154.
51. Ibid., 285.
53. Also contributing to this tendency to read Yorick’s description as Sterne’s self-description is the fact that Sterne had already encouraged his readers to mix up his sermons with Yorick’s, not only by attributing to Yorick the sermon that he inserted into Volume I but also by publishing a collection of his sermons as The Sermons of Parson Yorick in 1760.
54. Sterne, Tristram Shandy, 286.
55. Ibid., 288.
56. Ibid.
57. In a letter to Garrick written in March 1760, Sterne explicitly compares the rumors of his parody of Warburton to “one of the number of those which so unfairly brought poor Yorick to his grave.” Continuing, he allies himself with his apparent enemy, portraying the two of them as united against a nosy and censorious public: “The report might draw blood of the author of Tristram Shandy—but could not harm such a man as the author of the Divine Legation [i.e. Warburton].” Sterne, Works, 123.
58. Sterne, Tristram Shandy, 292.
59. Ibid., 22–23.
60. Ibid., 24.
64. Owen Ruffhead, Monthly Review 24 (February 1761), in Eighteenth-Century Collections Online, 102.
65. Critical Review 9 (January 1760), in Eighteenth-Century Collections Online, 73.
66. Sterne, Tristram Shandy, 8.
67. Ibid., 204.
68. Ibid.
69. Ibid., 16.
70. Ibid., 204.
71. Keymer, Sterne, 80.
73. Sterne, Works, 140.
74. Gallagher, Nobody’s Story, 22.
75. Sterne, Tristram Shandy, 422.
77. Sterne, Tristram Shandy, 346.
78. Ibid., 336.
79. Ibid., 67.
80. Cibber, Apology, 7.
82. Ibid., 346.
83. Ibid.
85. Sterne, Tristram Shandy, 337.
86. Ibid., 339.
87. Ibid., 345–346.
88. Ibid., 258.
91. Carr’s Volume III was identified as spurious relatively quickly, but Sterne’s contemporaries were much less sure about the authorship of a spurious Volume IX, and some who recognized it as a fraud nonetheless praised it as superior to Sterne’s actual volumes. Bosch notes that “some foreign publishers of Tristram Shandy have accidentally used the spurious Vol. IX for their editions.” Bosch, Labyrinth of Diggings, 13. See also Anne Bandry, “The Publication of the Spurious Volumes of ‘Tristram Shandy,’” Shandean 3 (1991): 126–135. Richard Griffith’s Posthumous Works of a Late Celebrated Author was also accepted as genuine upon its publication in 1770; and scholars are still debating whether The Clockmakers Outcry is a parody by an especially clever imitator or a self-promotional puff of Sterne’s. Bosch, 16–17.
92. Critical Review 9, 73.
95. *Clockmakers Outcry*, 40–42.

CHAPTER 4

1. King, *The Gendering of Men*, 248. Other scholars who have noted Garrick’s professionalization of the stage include George Winchester Stone Jr. and George M. Kahrl, Kristina Straub, Jean Benedetti, and Heather McPherson.

2. It is possible to map my terms “earnest” and “mimetic” performance onto Erving Goffman’s distinction between “sincere” and “cynical” performance. Goffman explains: “When the individual has no belief in his own act and no ultimate concern with the beliefs of his audience, we may call him cynical, reserving the term ‘sincere’ for individuals who believe in the impression fostered by their own performance.” I have avoided the term “cynical,” however, because of its negative connotations; all artists, performing plays that they know aren’t real, might fall under Goffman’s term “cynical.” For me, “mimetic” is to “cynical” as “fiction” is to “lie”: a term that recognizes the creative potential of delusion. Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (Woodstock, NY: Overlook Press, 1973), 18.


9. Ibid., 214.


11. Both Straub (Sexual Suspects) and Nussbaum (Rival Queens) read this scene in relationship to the tropes of the sentimental novel.


13. Ibid., 5:61.

14. Ibid.

15. Ibid., 5:61–62.

16. Ibid., 5:62.

pear’d on any Stage)” (6:5), Garrick had appeared on a London stage the preceding winter, when he filled in for a suddenly ill Richard Yates in the pantomime Harlequin Student (6:5). Highfill et al., Biographical Dictionary, 6, 5. “Nobody knew it,” Garrick wrote later to his brother Peter, “but [Yates] and Giffard.” Quoted in Highfill et al., Biographical Dictionary, 6:5. Between these two appearances, Garrick played Aboan in Oroonoko—and probably a few other roles—at a provincial theater in Ipswich. Highfill et al., Biographical Dictionary, 6:4.

18. The notable exceptions here are Kalman A. Burnim’s book, David Garrick: Director (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1961); Peter Holland’s article “David Garrick: ‘3dly, as an Author,’” Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture 25 (1996): 39–62; and Stuart Sherman’s article “Garrick Among the Media.” As Holland points out, Garrick’s contemporaries often praised his writing. “It is certain that his merit as an Author is not of the first magnitude,” admitted a writer for the Westminster Magazine, eulogizing Garrick just after his death, in February 1779; “but his great knowledge of men and manners, of stage effect, and his happy turn for lively and striking satire, made him generally successful; and his Prologues and Epilogues in particular, which are almost innumerable, possess such a degree of happiness, both in the conception and execution, as to stand unequalled.” “Memoirs of the Life of David Garrick,” Westminster Magazine (February 1779): 58.

19. Murphy, Life of David Garrick, 260.


21. Ibid., 139–140.

22. One of the first clues that Bayes is a representation of Garrick is the play’s cast list: in the original 1774 production, the role of Bayes was taken by Thomas King, who had played the playwright Glib in another of Garrick’s backstage dramas, A Peep Behind the Curtain. (The latter opened seven years before The Meeting of the Company; but King had played Glib as recently as May 14, 1774, four months before he assumed the role of Bayes.) Van Lennep et al., London Stage, 1660–1800, 4.1812. King’s lines in the prologue to A Peep Behind the Curtain capitalize upon the confusion between Garrick, the actor who actually wrote the play; Glib, the character who wrote the play within the play; and King, the actor playing the character who wrote the play within the play. In addition to these casting choices, Garrick signaled Bayes as a self-portrait through Bayes’s determination to train young actors in his style. Garrick was both celebrated and chastised for the rigorous training he offered to new actors in his company: “Mr. Garrick has been ever remarkably fond of teaching,” jeers “Nicholas Nipclose” (a pseudonym of Francis Gentleman) in a 1772 pamphlet. And in a jab at Garrick’s famously short stature, he adds, “We wonder he does not equip every male performer with cloaths of his own size, they would mostly fit as well as his manner.” Nipclose (Francis Gentleman, pseudo.), The Theatres: A Poetical Dissection (London: John Bell, 1772), 41n.
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