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Note on the Text

Titles of separately published poems and broadsheets are italicised, whereas titles of poems that are printed as part of a work or an anthology are in single inverted commas.

The guidelines in *The Chicago Manual of Style*, 15th edition, have been followed in the footnotes.
Introduction

‘That many, truly good and great, with candid Eye my Line survey’

Mary Barber’s volume *Poems on Several Occasions* (1734) was one of the first collections of poetry written by a woman to be published by subscription. The subscription list to this volume, which comprised 918 names — including a number of illustrious political, literary, and cultural figures — is a testament to her extensive involvement in the cultural and social circles of Dublin, Tunbridge Wells, Bath, and London during the decade spanning 1725-1735. This thesis provides an investigation and analysis of Barber’s method of securing publication by subscription, demonstrating the remarkable skill and social dexterity she brought to this task. This research thereby adds a new dimension to our understanding of the history of subscription publishing in the period. Using Barber's subscription list as a principal source, it demonstrates that, through the subscription process, women could and did engage in literary relationships with one another, as well as penetrate the male-dominated print culture of the era. Through her sophisticated understanding of the cultural field in which she operated, this thesis asserts, Barber skilfully managed her subscription process so as to profit from the social, literary, and political patronage connections she had already established in Ireland and England. Barber's literary achievement, then, lies not only in the poems she wrote, but also in her dexterity in negotiating of patronage relationships — a talent which earned her a wide readership for those same poems.

Barber’s use of subscription publishing has not escaped scholarly attention, but it has usually been accompanied by censure of her methods and her verse. Irvin Ehrenpreis castigated her for writing with ‘more attention to patrons than to her readers’.

---

1 Barber, ‘To a Lady, who commanded me to send her an Account in Verse, how I succeeded in my Subscription’, *Poems*, 275.
Williams, in his edition of Swift’s correspondence, dismissed her as an ‘indifferent versifier’.\(^3\) Christopher Fanning has argued that Barber’s method of approaching patrons — particularly her adoption of a deferential style of address to her patrons, her use of a poetic mask in certain poems and her decision to print others anonymously — weakened her authority as a writer.\(^4\) Adam Budd’s reading of her subscription method concludes that her desire to court so many subscribers, coupled with her arrest and long-term ill-health, resulted in a financial collapse that contributed to her ‘long-standing obscurity’.\(^5\) In arguing that Barber’s *Poems* were written solely out of pecuniary need, and, therefore, produced aesthetically inferior work, these critics neglect the volume’s complex production and publication history. More recently, Wendy Stewart has observed that: ‘Barber seems to have adopted the correct attitude of a minor writer, especially one publishing by subscription; dismissing her poetry because it demonstrates the circumstances of its production seems not only unfair but short-sighted.’\(^6\) This thesis views Barber’s use of subscription as proof of her professional acumen, and also as a sign of her willingness to engage with the material aspects of cultural production. It is an authorial strategy, an integral part of the way of her self-fashioning and identity as a writer.

In order to understand the ‘circumstances of production’ surrounding Barber's work, it is first necessary to give a brief overview of the processes of patronage and subscription in this period. Prior to the early eighteenth century, a ‘patronage’ relationship was one in which a single aristocratic patron, in return for the composition of creative work publicly dedicated to him or her, would provide a writer with valuable social cache, protection and financial support. By the early eighteenth century, this practice gave way to new concepts of

---


professional authorship in the literary marketplace. For writers working in the politically-charged literary climate of eighteenth-century England and Ireland, reliance on patronage by a single private individual was deemed incompatible with the requirement for independence associated with modern authorship. A professional writer should be servant to none but the public.⁷ Some authors regretted the demise of an ideal past in which monarchs and nobles supported literary endeavour of the highest quality, while others were happy to see the traditional patronage system fade away. In The Author’s Farce (1730), for example, Henry Fielding skewered the old relation between patron and client as being akin to prostitution: ‘Get a patron, be pimp to some worthless man of quality, write panegyrics on him, flatter him with as many virtues as he has vices.’⁸

Despite this gradual shift in patronage trends, the old-style persisted, as has been amply demonstrated by Paul Korshin, Jacob Leed, and Dustin Griffin.⁹ Griffin’s study, in particular, demonstrates that, far from drifting into decline, the system continued in altered forms throughout the eighteenth century. Patronage was not outgrown by the burgeoning literary marketplace: rather, it evolved to facilitate the changing demands of the era. According to Griffin, there was a sense in this period that the wealthy and powerful had an ‘obligation’ to support those in need.¹⁰ The moral foundation of ‘gift-giving’ was derived from the classical Senecan tradition of ‘benificence’ in which authors crediting the patron with fashionable virtues and motives would in return be granted favours, protection, and

---


⁸ Henry Fielding, *The Author’s Farce; and the Pleasures of the Town … Written by Scriberius Secundus* (London, 1730).


help. Pierre Bourdieu’s seminal study of symbolic capital, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, shows how patrons’ ability to confer non-material or ‘intangible’ goods, such as legitimacy and authority, has genuine economic value for the writer. These ‘intangibles’ produce what Bourdieu has termed ‘symbolic capital’ — a degree of accumulated prestige, celebrity and honour of the patron — and ‘cultural capital’ — relating to forms of cultural knowledge, disposition and taste. The patron — equipped in theory, by birth, education, taste, and leisure — is better qualified than her ‘inferiors’ to serve as the judge of literary merit. Thus, the patron had the potential to reassure a hesitant bookseller or bookbuyer.

Women’s relationship to literary patronage further complicates our understanding of the patronage system. While men were free to use ‘economy of favour’, whereby poetical translations, political or educational material dedicated to specific patrons could serve as a means to a political or ecclesiastical career, these paths were generally closed — or, at best, decidedly more problematic for women. Moreover, the difficulties surrounding the lack of a clear definition of patronage and what it meant to an eighteenth-century author impinged on the woman writer in a very particular way. Some women hesitated to enter into an arrangement whereby they implicitly engaged to exchange ‘benefits’ with a patron — especially a male patron — or to accept his ‘protection’ at a time when ‘protection’ was a euphemism for sexual ‘keeping’. However, many women writers sought and benefited from patronage relationships throughout the period, using poetry as a means to encourage and legitimise the patronage bond. These considerations highlight the need for individual case studies of the relationship between authors and their patrons which can be used as a means to

---

11 Seneca’s *De Beneficiis* elaborates the art of patronage, or of securing grateful obedience; it comprises the art of gracious giving, grateful receiving, and graceful requiting. ‘If a benefit is acknowledged, it is returned ... He who receives a benefit gladly has already returned it.’ Seneca, *De Beneficiis*, vol. 3. Quoted in, Dustin Griffin *Literary Patronage in England*, 5. See also Edward Andrew, ‘The Senecan Moment: Patronage and Philosophy in the Eighteenth Century’ *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 65. 2 (April, 2004): 277-99.


13 See *OED*, 1b, with examples from 1677.
challenge the traditional assumptions surrounding these methods of publication. This thesis
insists that Barber’s mode of approaching patrons was as strategic and deliberate as it was
successful.

From the earliest stages of her literary career, Barber adapted authorial strategies
appropriate to her objectives as a subscription poet, as the traditional patron-client
relationship was being transformed into a wider, if less stable, network of support. In the late
seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, merchant classes eager to distinguish themselves
through their collections of art and literature, as well as coffee-house enthusiasts, helped to
open up a cultural market for books, and for the first time authors began consciously
marketing their talents to a public readership. David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleery have
observed that this ‘rise of a reading public (with interests in and ability to pay for printed
works), created circumstances whereby authors moved from creating works with a view to
soliciting funds and support from a given patron, to seeking publication through subscriptions
and advance payment schemes.’ Indeed, in early eighteenth-century Britain and Ireland, the
production costs of subscription books were underwritten by advance purchase agreement
from buyers subscribing for one or more copies of the projected book. The author proposed to
produce a book of a specified matter, length, and format. He or she solicited subscriptions
personally and through friends or agents in order to achieve this. Subscribers usually paid
half the price at the time of the subscription, with the remainder due on delivery, and their
names were printed at the front of the volume. The object of subscription was to secure
down-payments on, and promises to purchase, a book before its publication. This ensured that

---

14 In the early eighteenth century, reading became a shared experience in the coffee-houses of London and
Dublin, and for the first time the book was seen as a commodity to be bought and sold. See John Barrell,
16 There is no comprehensive treatment of subscription publication and its history, but excellent studies detailing
various aspects of the subject include: Sarah Clapp ‘The Beginnings of Subscription Publication in the
Seventeenth Century’, Modern Philology, 29 (1931): 199-224, and ‘Subscription Publishers prior to Jacob
Guide (Newcastle Upon Tyne: Harold Hill and Son, 1975), 1-3; Thomas Lockwood, “Subscription-hunters and
production and distribution costs were covered before a work went to press, an arrangement that pleased the booksellers since it minimised risks and could promise large profits.\textsuperscript{17} Significantly, the subscriber represented the patron not as the commissioner of the work, but as one of its consumers: a conspicuously identified member of the reading public. The time-honoured ‘Link of patronage which held the Great and Learned together’ was now adapted to form a more ‘democratised system of patronage’ in the subscription list.\textsuperscript{18} For writers, subscription publication enabled them to employ not one but several influential and prominent persons from various sections of society. For women, subscription offered a means to secure publication without risking their reputations and, as Roger Lonsdale observes, by ‘the 1730s ... it became possible for women to publish volumes of their verse by subscription.’\textsuperscript{19} Barber’s impressive subscription list offers a window onto the different strata of eighteenth-century British and Irish society, and acts as an indication of Barber’s place within this intricate social and cultural network.

This thesis further argues that Barber’s poetry was in keeping with the general pattern of much light verse of the early eighteenth century. It also displays a particular skill in approaching her audience. Paula Backscheider’s recent anthology of eighteenth-century women’s poetry illustrates how the vogue of ‘dashing off’ poetry to comply with a friend’s request to celebrate a private occasion or to display the ability to write polished extemporaneous verse constituted an important part of social etiquette and refinement.\textsuperscript{20} More than one-third of Barber’s poems are associated with specific occasions, named in the titles. These occasions are wide-ranging. They include such situations as a friend requesting advice, recovery from sickness, the act of reading books by others, viewing portraits and

\textsuperscript{17} John Brewer, \textit{The Pleasures of the Imagination}, 164.
other works of art, apologies, etiquette and the exigencies of marriage and ageing. Most of her poems were written during a period of fitful activity between Tunbridge Wells, Bath, London and Dublin. They are characterised by the use of flattery, genial good humour, graceful compliment, and apology for social presumption. While some contemporary critics, such as Fanning and Budd, have argued that these qualities make Barber's work inferior from an aesthetic perspective, I argue, after Stewart, that the use of these techniques was a necessary circumstance of poetic production for Barber. In fact, they were a vital part of her subscription strategy. Moreover, this method was clearly a successful one: all of these poems earned her some form of patronage or subscription.

Barber’s poetic strategy also enabled her to put forward a public persona that positioned her as a woman of commendable modesty and morals. In the preface to her Poems, Barber explained that she had begun writing verse ‘chiefly to form the Minds of my Children’, by making difficult precepts easier to memorise, and to teach them to speak clearly. Lonsdale maintains that Barber ‘no doubt made herself all the more acceptable to her fashionable subscribers by emphasising her modest literary pretensions’ as well as being ‘the first woman poet to make a virtue out of the original educational purposes of her poems (for her son) and the domestic content of many of them’.21 Barber’s modesty may indeed have made her a favourable role model for her children; however, it is also true that her method served as an example to other women writers on how to use domestic education and maternal authority as a method of asserting themselves through print in the period.

A full analysis of the trajectory of Barber’s subscription process illuminates the way in which she used poetry to navigate the traditional patronage system and pursue valuable subscriptions. Unlike Fanning and Budd, whose discussions focus on the period in which Barber produced and published her Poems, this dissertation emphasises Barber’s earlier

---

patronage relationships because — according to Bourdieu’s concept of the cultural field — these were the years during which she accumulated the cultural and symbolic capital necessary to launch a successful subscription publication.

Since this thesis contends that Barber’s early years as a writer were crucial to her successful use of subscription publishing, it is necessary to provide a brief history of the events that led to the printing of her *Poems*. Mary Barber (ca. 1685–1755) married Rupert Barber, originally from Middlesex, England, who was working as a linen draper in Dublin; the date unknown. The couple had nine children in total, five of whom died in their infancy. The four who survived were: Constantine (b. 1714), who later became President of the Royal College of Physicians; Mira, (b. 1717), their only daughter; Rupert (b. 1719), a miniaturist painter; and Lucius (b. 1720), about whom little is known. The family lived on Werburgh Street from at least 1705 until at least 1724 and ran a drapery shop on Capel Street (see Appendix 3 for map). Rupert, Sr. also had rights to a property in Glasnevin. In 1719, he witnessed the lease of the house nearby known as ‘Delville’ to clergyman and poet, Patrick Delany, and physician, Dr. Richard Helsham. Patrick Delany (1685/6–1768) was born in Rathkreagh, County Laois, and educated at Trinity College, where he was elected to a fellowship. He had a reputation as one of the college’s foremost tutors and as one of the best preachers in Dublin. In 1724 he was appointed professor of oratory and history. Archbishop Hugh Boulter, keen to see Delany’s influence within the college diminished, refused to allow him to combine his fellowship with the incumbency of Dublin parish, St John’s. However, in

---

22 In his acclaimed study, *The Field of Cultural Production*, Bourdieu defines the field of cultural production as ‘the system of objective relations between these agents or institutions [such as writers, painters, sculptors, critics, publishers, dealers, reviews, magazines, academy and coteries] and as the site of the struggles for the monopoly of the power to consecrate, in which the value of works of art and belief in that value are continuously generated.’ Pierre Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production*, ed. and introduced by Randa Johnson (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), 78.


1728, backed by Dean Swift and the lord lieutenant, Carteret, Delany received the chancellorship of Christ Church Cathedral. Within two years he added the chancellorship of Dublin’s second cathedral, St Patrick’s.

Delany was active in literary and social circles in Dublin. He held informal gatherings of literary enthusiasts in both his Delville home and his Stafford Street residence in Dublin city. He consciously cultivated sociability, but most importantly, for my thesis, he was supportive of women writers. He felt that women should be educated so that they might be better prepared for becoming faithful friends of, and amiable companions to, their husbands (in the mode, no doubt, of his own wife). Attendees at his informal gatherings included Mary Barber; the scholar, Constantia Grierson, and the young Laetitia Pilkington, wife of clergyman Matthew Pilkington. Barber had made an early impression on Patrick Delany in 1725 with the publication of *To the Right Honourable the Lord Carteret On Seeing a Poem Intitled The Birth of Manly Virtue*. Her eulogy to Carteret was written as a response to Delany’s translation of the Callimachus text, *The Birth of Manly Virtue* — also dedicated to Carteret that same year. Also in 1725, Barber penned *The Widow’s Address to the Right Hon. the Lady Carteret*, a verse petition on behalf of an army officer’s widow. This reached Lady Carteret, wife of the lord lieutenant of Ireland, as did another poem, *To the Honourable Miss Carteret*, which was written on the same theme and dedicated to the Carterets’ daughter, Grace. These poems resulted in her introduction to the Carteret family, but more crucially, they brought her into Delany’s literary coterie at Delville.

By 1728, Delany had introduced Barber to Jonathan Swift. She was quickly established as Swift’s ‘Chief Poetess’ and he included her in his ‘triumfeminate,’ along with Constantia Grierson and Elizabeth Sican. What Laetitia Pilkington referred to as the ‘Senatus

---

Consultum’ (comprising Delany, Grierson and Pilkington, with Swift as chairman) would regularly meet to read and correct Barber’s verse. She was the only one of the three women to print a collection of her poems. Rather than arrange for them to be printed in Dublin — as her contemporary, Matthew Pilkington, did — Barber launched an ambitious subscription project which took three years to complete, and which took place between four locations: Dublin, Tunbridge Wells, Bath and London. (For detailed discussion of Barber’s patronage relationships in Delany’s literary circle, see Chapters 1 and 2.)

In the summer of 1730, Barber left Dublin for Tunbridge Wells, England. She worked hard to exploit her connections in order to garner subscriptions for her printed volume. She contributed poems to the *Tunbrigialia, or, Tunbridge Miscellanies, for the Year 1730*. During this time, Swift began an elaborate campaign to promote her subscription volume, writing letters of introduction for her to many of his aristocratic and literary friends in England. A large and impressive list of over 900 names was assembled, including Alexander Pope, John Arbuthnot, John Gay, Sir Robert Walpole, and many of the English, Irish and Scottish nobility. (For in-depth analysis of Barber’s subscription list, see Chapter 3).

However, delays and obstacles plagued Barber’s subscription process as well. She irritated Alexander Pope by trying to get him to correct her verse — evidently expecting the encouragement she had readily obtained from the *Senatus Consultum* at Delville. Swift also became agitated in 1731 when a letter was sent to Queen Caroline, ostensibly signed by him, in support of her subscription. Barber suffered increasingly from fits of gout and rheumatism for which she was treated by the famous London physician Dr. Richard Mead. These delayed her subscription and tested the patience of her subscribers in England, who were eager to get a return on their subscription guineas. The delay was protracted by Swift’s unsuccessful attempt to persuade Alderman John Barber (no relation to Mary), while he was Lord Mayor
of London, to find her husband a post in 1732. (For a full discussion of these events see Chapter 4.)

To further complicate matters, Barber was arrested early in 1734, along with Matthew Pilkington and others, for the possession of manuscript copies of Swift’s politically subversive poems attacking the Walpole administration. *An Epistle to a Lady* and *On Poetry A Rapsody* were considered libellous and warranted the charge of treason. Barber, who was betrayed by Matthew Pilkington, was placed under arrest until she was released on £200 bail on 1 February 1734. Over the next year, Barber faced a protracted court summons until she was finally discharged on 27 May 1735. Despite all of these delays, Barber's volume was printed as a handsome quarto with its illustrious list of over 900 names in 1735. It was subsequently reprinted in an octavo edition in 1735 (and reissued in 1736). Swift and Delany generously subscribed for ten copies each. The volume was dedicated to John Boyle, fifth Earl of Orrery (1707-1762), of the illustrious Boyle family, who was on intimate terms with Delany and Swift. In addition, the printer she chose was Samuel Richardson, one of the leading London printers of novels and poetry during the period. Richardson also subscribed to her volume. The successful publication of her *Poems* enabled her to remain for a time in ‘genteel’ Bath, where she was joined by her children, Mira, Rupert and Lucius, while her husband remained in Dublin to carry on the linen business. (See Chapter 5 for a full discussion of these events.)

This thesis holds that Barber’s significance lies in her achievement as a woman poet who attracted an impressive list of subscribers, and also in her development of sophisticated strategies in order to garner that support. It explores Barber’s relationships to her patrons and her most immediate readers — the subscribers to her *Poems*. Hence, analysis of her poems largely concentrates on a discussion of their implications for her patronage and subscription. Barber’s design was not — at least, explicitly — to become a celebrated poet and to achieve
literary fame and distinction. Instead, she saw the subscription method as a viable way to provide for herself and her family. In doing so, and with such vigour and professionalism, Barber became a model for successful publishing by subscription.

The first chapter examines Barber’s earliest patronage relationships in Dublin — with the Carterets, Delany and Swift — through a detailed analysis of three poems: To the Right Honourable the Lord Carteret On Seeing a Poem Intitled The Birth of Manly Virtue; The Widow’s Address to the Right Hon. the Lady Carteret; and To the Honourable Miss Carteret. All three were printed separately in Dublin in 1725, constituting her poetic debut. This chapter explores how Barber used these poems as a means of approaching the lord lieutenant of Ireland, Lord Carteret, and his family. Barber uses her verse to Carteret to present an opposition between poetry and painting in order to establish poetry as the preeminent artistic medium. This reading of To the Right Honourable the Lord Carteret on seeing a poem entited The Birth of Manly Virtue also contextualises her work in relation to a literary community in Dublin. This chapter identifies a specific poetic interaction between Barber, Delany, and Laetitia Pilkington. It redefines Delany’s role within the coterie that comprised ‘polite’ Dublin society. Earlier considerations of the patronage relations between Delany, Swift, and the women writers in their close-knit Dublin circle have tended to privilege Swift as chief patron. As a lifelong friend and patron, Delany’s value to Barber has been underestimated in comparison to Swift. This chapter demonstrates that Barber’s response to Delany’s translation of The Birth of Manly Virtue (1725) enabled her to create her own tribute to the lord lieutenant, which, in turn, gained for her the support of both Delany and Lord Carteret.

This chapter also demonstrates how Barber adopted authorial strategies appropriate to her objectives as a writer. In The Widow’s Address to the Right Hon. the Lady Carteret, she adapted the legal discourse of the petition: a move that garners support for Barber’s own
writing under cover of its request for support of the widow herself. This analysis presents Barber’s petition as a strategic rhetorical device targeted at courting Lady Carteret’s patronage, an important justification for entering into print. Contrary to Fanning’s argument, which claims that Barber’s deference and anonymity diminished her authority as a writer, I argue that this petition’s success indicates that Barber was able to manipulate a traditional patronage relationship in order to cultivate support for her own writing.

The second chapter introduces Constantia Grierson, and investigates her role as Barber’s friend and supporter. This chapter argues for a broader view of patronage and its functions during the period. In his discussion of literary patronage, John Brewer, has argued how, in early eighteenth century literary circles: ‘Authors were not only producers of literature, but were also among its most important patrons.’

This chapter shows that literary friendship was a mutual, supportive interaction. Both women shared, shaped and supported each other’s writing and became as influential on one another as the male patrons to whom they dedicated their works. In her Preface, Barber pointed to Grierson, whose scholarly reputation as a classicist had been established by her printed translations, and whose ‘virtue’ was widely recognised. Swift observed that Grierson was ‘a very good Latin and Greek Scholar’.

In her Preface, Barber pointed to the scholarly and virtuous qualities of Grierson’s character: ‘She was too learned to be vain, too wise to be conceited, too knowing and too clear-sighted to be irreligious.’ Significantly, Grierson’s poetry survives largely because it was included in Barber’s collection: this is a lasting testament to the power of such literary ‘friendships.’

This argument is buttressed by an exploration of the ways in which Barber and Grierson engaged in a mutually supportive relationship through verse. Their poems to and about their sons create intimacy, but more importantly, this interaction challenges existing

29 Barber, *Poems*, xxviii.
critical assumptions, outlined above, that Barber’s patronage relationships were superficial connections born solely out of financial obligation. This chapter further demonstrates how Barber used her literary relationship with Grierson as a testing-ground for developing relationships with female patrons. This is particularly evident in the pair’s verse approaches to Martha Percival, a significant figure in Dublin society, whose family was closely involved in George Berkeley’s Bermuda Scheme (1724–1730). Barber and Grierson each dedicated verses on Berkeley’s project to Percival; both were later printed in Barber’s *Poems*. Barber’s poem petitioned Percival as a patron and friend, while Grierson took the opportunity to engage Percival on the darker political aspects of Ireland’s economic situation. The examination of these poems explores the ways in which the women influenced each other’s work in order to demonstrate that the terms of patronage could encompass personal friendships as well as financial relationships. This prefigures the way in which Barber would approach female aristocratic subscribers in England.

Patronage could nurture literary talent only to the threshold of its confrontation with a wider public; beyond that point, it would require critical approbation and some measure of commercial viability to ratify its status. The third chapter provides, for the first time, a full contextual and statistical analysis of Barber’s subscription list, which allows for an authoritative rather than speculative commentary upon Barber’s subscription. Moreover, this investigation of her list illuminates its social context. As Pat Rogers asserts, ‘few facts in literary discussion are so unambiguously facts as the names of subscribers.’ Pat Rogers, ‘Book Subscriptions among the Augustans’, *Times Literary Supplement*, 15 December 1972, 1539. The subscription list performed this function splendidly: it was arranged according to a social hierarchy in which peers, clergy and other notable names were clustered at the top of the list. The arrangement meant that the list could be easily (and avidly) scanned for names. This analysis demonstrates how Barber’s list of 918 names, including important political, cultural
and literary figures, indicates her extensive participation in Dublin and London cultural circles. This chapter contextualises subscription in Britain and Ireland, addressing specifically, how subscription pertained to women writers, in order to evaluate Barber’s achievement. It shows how that Barber was atypical in the sheer size of her list; her wide range of subscribers was more impressive than many of her male and female contemporaries (including Swift, Pilkington, Masters, and Adams), while it was typical in its preoccupation with status and class. The list is overwhelmingly composed of members of the gentry and aristocracy. The statistics show that just over half of her list is drawn from the three peerages of Britain and Ireland. This demonstrates her success in penetrating elite social circles. Unsurprisingly, owing to her patronage relationship with Delany and Swift, the Dublin clergy form a conspicuous group on Barber’s list. Their presence is also important in that it suggested a certain moral approval and lent respectability to a married woman writing for money. Barber also received support from the literary sphere, the professional and mercantile classes. Thus, this chapter argues that Barber’s subscription list provides a bridge between different ranks of society and reflects the interactions among different groups on the basis of a shared interest in poetry and patronage.

Combining this statistical analysis with a narrative of Barber's subscription process provides readers with a clearer picture of that process, and, by extension, subscription processes more generally in the period. Thus, the fourth chapter provides the first comprehensive narrative account of Barber’s subscription endeavour in England, which took her three years to complete. This chapter provides a chronological narrative of Barber’s subscription endeavours in England and Ireland, thereby allowing a full account of her subscription practice. This is divided into three sections. The first concentrates upon Barber’s subscription-seeking at Tunbridge Wells and Bath. It examines critically the dedications she addressed to these subscribers, arguing that their function was to form connections to polite
society, thus allowing Barber to gain access to important figures across various social groups. This section provides new insights into this particular kind of verse and its function. The second section, then, shifts the focus onto Barber’s subscription-gathering in London, and, specifically, to Swift’s efforts to garner support on her behalf. Swift’s interventions with aristocratic subscribers and with his friends and associates in literary circles on Barber’s behalf are analysed in order to reveal the agency women had in every facet of Barber’s subscription in London. This is particularly reflected in Swift’s selection of four women ‘Collectors’ who would generate support and deal with the practical aspects of Barber’s subscription in London. Swift’s significance as a patron is also revealed through Barber’s implication in the forgery of letters to Queen Caroline and Charlotte Clayton in 1731. This incident, which held the potential to jeopardise Barber’s subscription, raises the important consideration of how women writers could project their work publicly without risking their reputations. This section also investigates the apparently perplexing presence of subscribers on Barber’s list from both political parties, e.g. Sir Robert Walpole. Barber’s ability to gain subscriptions from both the Whig and Tory parties is testament to her skill and ambition, demonstrating the way in which women writers could subtly penetrate the political sphere without being political. The final section of this chapter examines the consolidation of Barber’s subscription in Dublin. While Dublin was the centre of Barber’s literary efforts, she expended little energy collecting subscribers there, which was largely as a result of Delany and Swift’s influence. Instead, she was preoccupied with preparations for returning to London in order to print her Poems. This, it is argued, is reflected both in her poetry and her approach to Alderman Barber of London. In these ways, this chapter re-examines the means used, the persons employed and the aims expressed, with a view to assessing Barber’s subscription ‘success’.
The concluding chapter investigates the circumstances surrounding the closure of her subscription and the events leading up to the publication of her volume, *Poems on Several Occasions* (1734), in order to complete the picture of Barber’s subscription endeavour. Continuing struggles with gout and, most distressingly, her arrest for her part in carrying Swift’s ‘seditious’ poems into England, severely tested her resolve and delayed publication of the volume for nearly two years. These obstacles have also cast a critical shadow on Barber’s achievement. While Budd has argued that her arrest, combined with her method of attracting subscribers, led to bankruptcy and eventual obscurity, I argue for Barber’s ability to navigate strategically these obstacles and successfully publish her *Poems*. Barber achieved this by omitting her arrest in the Preface, and by decisively cutting ties with Matthew and Laetitia Pilkington when that relationship no longer served her. Moreover, Barber was careful to manage the final details of her subscription practice so as to maximise the economic benefits for herself and her family. The printer and publisher she chose for her volume, Samuel Richardson and Charles Rivington, were leading members of the London print trade during this period. Her *Poems* was reprinted in octavo format in 1735 (reissued in 1736) and facilitated by eight fashionable booksellers in London and Bath. She orchestrated the distribution of her *Poems* from Arthur Pond’s studio in Convent Garden so that her son, Rupert, might benefit in making potentially useful employment connections. For Barber, perhaps, the greatest reward was the realisation of her ambition to settle with her family in ‘genteel’ Bath (a victory that was dampened only by recurring fits of gout). Her securing of the rights to Swift’s *Polite Conversation* cemented Barber’s connection to polite circles.

In sum, this thesis holds that Barber’s significance lies both, in her achievement as the poet who attracted the most subscriptions from the widest possible range of supporters in the first half of the eighteenth century and, in her development of sophisticated strategies to foster patronage relationships and garner subscriptions. By interrogating Barber’s patronage
relationships and subscription practices this thesis provides a more complete picture of her literary activities. In a wider sense it reflects the way in which the careful management of patronage relationships and employment of subscription as a method of publication, enabled women to successfully access the sphere of print in early eighteenth-century England.
In 1725, Mary Barber made her poetic debut in Dublin with the publication of three poems dedicated, respectively, to the newly appointed viceroy of Ireland, John, Lord Carteret; his wife, Lady Frances Carteret; and their daughter, Grace. Carteret, who served as Ireland’s lord lieutenant from 1724 to 1730, was the subject of Barber’s fulsome encomium, *To His Excellency the Lord Carteret, Occasioned by Seeing a Poem Intitled The Birth of Manly Virtue* (referencing a recent Dublin composition). Her poem, *The Widow’s Address to the Right Hon. the Lady Carteret*, was written as a petition seeking assistance from Lady Carteret in securing the rightful pension of a war widow, on whose behalf Barber pleaded. The poetic petition was accompanied by a shorter verse, ‘To the Honourable Miss Carteret’, addressed to Grace on the same theme. All three poems were later included in Barber’s *Poems on Several Occasions* (1734).

This chapter explores how Barber used these poems as a means of approaching the viceregal family for support in Dublin. Barber’s poetic dedication to Lord Carteret was at once ambitious and constructive. Her strategy in this poem was to present an opposition between poetry and portraiture in order to establish poetry as the superior artistic medium, and the most worthy means of obtaining patronage. Thus, Barber argues, the poet must be duly credited for her efforts to render an accurate likeness of a patron through verse. This poem also enables us to contextualise the literary community from which Barber emerged in Dublin. I argue that her poem responds to two others: *The Birth of Manly Virtue*, from

---

1 *The Widow’s Address* and *To the Honourable Miss Carteret* were printed together on a folio sheet by Dublin printer and publisher, Cornelius Carter, who operated from the Post Office Coffee House, Fishamble Street (1697–1729) [dates of trade]. *To the Right Honourable the Lord Carteret on seeing a poem entituled the Birth of Manly Virtue* was also printed on a folio sheet by Dublin printer and publisher Sarah Harding, who printed for Swift following the death of her husband John Harding. Harding operated from Molesworth Court, Fishamble Street (1721–1725) [dates of trade], and on the Blind Quay, near Fishamble Street (1725–27) [dates of trade]. See also James W. Phillips, *Printing and Bookselling in Dublin, 1670-1800: A Bibliographical Enquiry* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1998), 254-6.
Callimachus and A Poem Inscribed to the Author of The Birth of Manly Virtue, both of which were anonymously printed in Dublin that same year. The first of these poems, The Birth of Manly Virtue, from Callimachus, has since been attributed to clergyman (and close friend of Swift), Patrick Delany (c.1685–1768). To date, the authorship of A Poem Inscrib’d to the Author of the Birth of Manly Virtue has not been attributed to any one individual; I suggest that it was likely written by Laetitia Pilkington – a key figure in Swift’s Dublin literary circle who, along with her husband, Matthew, would figure prominently in the later events of Barber’s literary endeavour. My analysis demonstrates how Barber’s poem responds both to Patrick Delany’s translation and (as I see it) Pilkington’s poem in order to create her own eulogy to the lord lieutenant. My reading further shows how this poem prompts us to redefine Delany’s early influence on this Dublin circle. Between 1718 and the 1730s, Swift was the leading figure of intellectual and poetic life in Dublin and, as such, has been the focus of critics’ engagement with Dublin literary production. However, to focus exclusively on the assumption of Swift’s assumed control over this literary sphere is to elide the agency of Patrick Delany, especially on the development of women writers, and particularly, Mary Barber.

Barber’s address to Lady Carteret serves both an imaginative and a practical function: it adapts the legal discourse of the petition to gain support for herself and for an impoverished widow in Dublin. My analysis presents Barber’s petition as a strategic rhetorical device which courted Lady Carteret’s patronage. In this way, I challenge Christopher Fanning’s interpretation of Barber’s approach. Fanning claims that her adoption of a deferential style of address to Lady Carteret, in the preface to her Poems and her decision to publish the poem

---

2 Patrick Delany’s translation of The Birth of Manly Virtue, from Callimachus was first published in 1725 in Dublin by George Grierson, both as a folio pamphlet and as a small octavo pamphlet. See The Poems of Patrick Delany: Comprising also Poems about Him by Jonathan Swift, Thomas Sheridan, and Other Friends and Enemies, ed. Robert Hogan and Donald C. Mell (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2006), 132.

anonymously, diminished her authority as a writer.\textsuperscript{4} I argue that the success of this petition demonstrates how Barber was able to manipulate the terms of the traditional patronage relationship in order to cultivate support and protection for her own writing. The poem, with its emphasis on obligation and support, further anticipates how Barber would approach her subscribers (particularly women aristocrats) in England. Poetry thus constituted a medium through which Barber was able to cultivate a literary reputation and make a critical transition from the private domestic sphere to the public sphere of print.

\textit{Lord Carteret as patron}

To understand Carteret’s patronage influence it is useful to frame his activity in political and literary circles. To date, two biographies have been written about Lord Carteret, both of which attest to the disappointingly meagre records of his personal life.\textsuperscript{5} What we do know suggests Carteret’s prominence as a statesman and desirability as a patron. John Carteret (1690–1763), second Baron Carteret, was the eldest of two sons of George, first Baron Carteret, and Lady Grace Granville (youngest daughter of John, first Earl of Bath).\textsuperscript{6} He was educated at Westminster School and Christ Church, Oxford, where Edward Harley (son of Tory first minister, Lord Oxford) was a friend. Carteret succeeded his father in 1695 and in 1711 he took his seat in the House of Lords. Following the death of Queen Anne in 1714, and the subsequent Hanoverian succession, Carteret associated himself with the Whig interest. His scholarly gifts, versatility and charismatic personality combined to build an impressive reputation as an astute politician. Assuming his hereditary seat in the House of

\textsuperscript{4} Christopher Fanning, ‘The Voices of the Dependent Poet: The Case of Mary Barber’, \textit{Women’s Writing} 8 (2001): 81-97; 84.


Lords at just 21, Carteret became an ambassador to Sweden at 29, and Secretary of State at 30 — an age when, as Swift ironically observed, ‘according to custom, he ought to have been busied in losing Money in the Chocolate House’.\(^7\) Scottish author, Tobias Smollett (1721–1771) — who was admittedly biased in his favour — believed that ‘Since Grenville [Carteret] was turned out, there was no minister in this nation worth the meal that whitened his periwig’.\(^8\) With the backing of the earl of Sunderland, Carteret became secretary of state for the southern department in March 1721. As the only German-speaking government minister, he wielded considerable influence with George I, regularly acting as lord justice during court in the king’s absence. Such fame and recognition inevitably prompted Carteret’s enemies to undermine him. The Whig split in 1717 created an infamous and bitter rivalry between Carteret and his supporters, against brothers-in-law, Sir Robert Walpole and Charles, second Viscount Townshend, who formed the Whig opposition.\(^9\) The economic crisis following the South Sea Bubble, coupled with the persistent political manoeuvrings of the Walpole-Townshend opposition, resulted in Carteret’s defeat in parliament in 1724 and his transfer to the lord lieutenancy of Ireland.\(^10\)

The Carterets arrived in Dublin on 22 October 1724. That Carteret convinced the Irish people, and Swift, of his ability and friendship to the people is key to understanding his appeal and influence as a patron in Dublin. On paper, viceregal powers in Ireland appeared extensive. Viceroy could pardon all crimes except treason, remit fines, issue proclamations, issue money out of the treasury, grant warrants, appoint judges and deputies, and appoint to


\(^10\) Robert Walpole to Newcastle: ‘I should not be for sending him over now, if I did not think it would end in totally recalling him. We shall at least get rid of him there.’ Quoted in Williams, *Carteret and Newcastle*, 70.
all benefices in the gift of the crown except archbishoprics, bishoprics, and deaneries.\textsuperscript{11} In practice, the role was something of a poisoned chalice: recurring famine, chronic poverty, squabbling clergymen seeking lucrative church positions and political upheaval continually plagued Ireland’s governors.\textsuperscript{12} Ireland was viewed as a nation undeserving of sympathy and English policy was avowedly antagonistic to Irish interests. When the Carterets arrived, the country was gripped in the frenzy of the Wood’s Halfpence controversy — the scheme to impose a privately minted copper coinage of inferior quality by William Wood.\textsuperscript{13} Carteret believed that the patent should be withdrawn and, although he could not be seen to submit too easily to Irish pressure, handled the problem adroitly. He went through the motions of searching for the author of the inflammatory Drapier’s Letters (Swift) before warning the Walpole government that the patent should be withdrawn and Wood compensated privately. Although Swift’s authorship was common knowledge, Carteret indirectly warned him against owning up, which would only have deepened the crisis. Carteret also balanced firmness with tact, making it clear that, in spite of the patent, nobody would be forced to accept the coinage. On 21 September 1725, the patent was suspended. Carteret’s actions in this affair sealed his reputation as a judicious and concerned governor of Ireland. More importantly, it won him the favourable opinion of Swift. Throughout Carteret’s term in Ireland, their relationship was one of mutual respect, cemented by the successful conclusion of the Wood controversy.

Swift acknowledged Carteret’s ability, although he made clear his distinction between Carteret, the man, and Carteret, the viceroy: ‘I did the most that Friendship can, / I hate the

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{12} McCracken, A New History of Ireland, 4: 112-113.
\textsuperscript{13} For a full account of Lord Carteret’s involvement in the Wood’s Halfpence affair see Patrick McNally, ‘Wood’s Halfpence, Carteret, and the Government of Ireland, 1723-6’, Irish Historical Studies 30 (May 1997): 354-76.
\end{flushleft}
Viceroy, love the man." And yet, in his capacity as viceroy, Carteret built a reputation for mercantile, social and clerical reform. He could do little to modify the mercantilist system that bore heavily on Ireland’s trade. However, he attempted to put the country’s economic affairs on a sounder basis and implemented measures to help alleviate famine-stricken, rural areas. He tackled the tax burden on Irish woollens exported to England (which surely delighted Mary Barber and her husband, the woollen draper, Rupert Barber) by reducing the prohibitive tax of 7s. 6d. a pound levied there on woollens and silk manufactured in Ireland. Soldiers’ conditions in Ireland were also improved. Perhaps most impressive was Carteret’s determination to set about correcting abuses within the church system. During the 1710s and 1720s, ecclesiastical preferment had been a continually troublesome area. Given the agitated state of Irish politics, English ministers agreed that the majority of ecclesiastical posts should be awarded to English clerics. This, of course, created a deep grievance among the Irish, particularly as many of these English appointees were content to draw Irish salaries in England without ever visiting the country. Carteret, despite finding a formidable opponent in Archbishop Hugh Boulter (Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of Ireland), identified himself with Irish interests and attempted to get Irishmen for Irish posts. In ecclesiastical appointments, he was particularly influenced by Swift, who told him that ‘as long as you are

14 Jonathan Swift, A Libel on the Reverend Dr. Delany and his Excellency, John Lord Carteret (Dublin, 1730).
16 Carteret personally investigated the country’s finances on arrival. His enquiries, he told Newcastle, revealed an actual deficiency of £80,000 in the Treasury at Christmas 1724, due to corrupt officials at Customs and a badly chosen commission, which Carteret set about replacing. In 1728, Carteret’s introduction of ‘The Bog Bill’ was a measure to help rural areas stricken by famine and poverty. Williams Carteret and Newcastle, 72-73. See also McCracken, A New History of Ireland, 4: 112-113.
17 Williams, Carteret and Newcastle, 74.
18 On his arrival in Dublin, Carteret found that soldiers’ pay was in arrears, the state of their barracks and hospitals was deplorable and many officers were found to be absent from their posts. The prospect of war with Spain in 1725 undeniably forced him to take action for the security of the country. This included correcting wage anomalies, seeing that garrisons were up to strength, reviving troops and inspiring them with his own ardent spirit. See Toby Barnard, A New Anatomy of Ireland: The Irish Protestants, 1649-1770 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 177-207.
19 Barnard, A New Anatomy of Ireland, 81-114.
governing here, I shall expect the liberty of telling you my thoughts; and I hope you will consider these until you find I grow impertinent and have some bias of my own’. The potential for nepotism was evident as early as 1725, when Swift suggested to Carteret no fewer than nine of his friends, including clergyman and poet, Thomas Sheridan and Patrick Delany, for Church appointments. It is little wonder, that, when asked about his experience in Ireland during his term of office, Carteret remarked: ‘When people ask me how I govern’d Ireland, I say I pleased Dr. Swift.’

Carteret was also a bibliophile and keen patron of the arts. His wife, Frances, revealed that he ‘walks miles every day and reads folios every night’. Though likely an exaggeration of Carteret’s physical and literary abilities, the viceroy’s knowledge of the ancient classics was reputedly impressive. According to the earl of Shelbourne, Carteret was ‘the best Greek scholar of the age’. He was responsible for encouraging the great Greek scholar, Richard Bentley (1662–1742), to produce his edition of Homer, and, when Carteret attended a performance of a Sophocles play by Dr. Sheridan’s pupils in Dublin, he amazed his host with his knowledge of the play. He was good friends with Joseph Addison in England and greatly admired John Gay’s *The Beggar’s Opera* (1728), when he saw its first performance in Dublin (presumably the satire on Walpole would have appealed to him). More significantly for Barber, Carteret was known to support aspiring writers financially. According to the earl

---


21 Swift later confessed to John Gay that Carteret ‘had six times a regard to my recommendations by preferring so many of my friends in the church; the last two acts of his favour were to add to the dignities of Dr. Delany and Mr. Stopford’. Swift to Gay 19 November 1730, *Swift Corr.* 3: 190. Robert Clayton was also promoted to the bishopric of Killala on the eve of Carteret’s departure on 22 June 1730. See also Williams, *Carteret and Newcastle*, 74.

22 Cannon, ‘Carteret, John, second Earl Granville (1690–1763)’

23 Toby Barnard, *Making the Grand Figure, Lives and Possessions in Ireland, 1641-1770* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 11.


25 Williams, *Carteret and Newcastle*, 94.
of Egmont, Carteret initiated ‘a generous design’ for obtaining subscriptions of ten guineas from noblemen and gentry to rescue ‘ingenious authors’ from the clutches of printers and booksellers. These subscriptions went toward the printing of their works, all profits remaining to the authors.\textsuperscript{26}

Accessible, witty and sociable, Carteret spent much of his time in Dublin and was friendly with many of the city’s leading social and literary figures, including Patrick Delany, Thomas Sheridan, Francis Hutcheson and, of course, Swift. According to Laetitia Pilkington, Delany’s Delville home, known as the seat of inspiration and engagement for his literary circle, also intrigued the viceroy who ‘dropped in’ for a convivial chat:

Lord Carteret, in his Lieutenancy, being very fond of [Delany] who is indeed worthy of universal Esteem, came one Day, quite unattended, and told the Doctor he was come to dine with him. He thank’d his Excellency for the Honour he conferr’d on him, and invited him to walk into his (beautiful) Gardens; which his Excellency did, with great good Humour.\textsuperscript{27}

As Norma Clarke has observed, Laetitia Pilkington likely exaggerated the informality, but clearly there was something for Carteret — a serious scholar — in the company at Delville.\textsuperscript{28}

Swift, Delany and Sheridan also wrote poems, riddles and rhymes to the viceroy, often characterised by their teasing and playfully competitive nature.\textsuperscript{29} Swift preferred to consider himself an advisor to Carteret; Delany, on the other hand, was noted for his ingratiating attempts to solicit additional preferment from the viceroy to finance his ambitious projects. One such example, An Epistle to His Excellency Lord Carteret (Dublin, 1729) Delany’s


\textsuperscript{27} In her Memoirs, Laetitia Pilkington also observed how ‘Lord Carteret, who, tho’ a Courtier, hated Ceremony when he sought Pleasure.’ Elias, ed., Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington, 2: 391, 283-84.

\textsuperscript{28} Norma Clarke, Queen of the Wits (London: Faber and Faber, 2008), 39.

\textsuperscript{29} Delany’s poems to the Carterets included: A Riddle by the Revd. Doctor Delany, Inscribed to the Lady Carteret (Dublin, 1726); Another Riddle by the Revd. Doctor Delany, An Epistle to His Excellency John Lord Carteret (Dublin, 1729). Swift’s poems included A Libel on the Reverend Dr. Delany, His Excellency John, Lord Carteret (Dublin, 1730). Sheridan dedicated a further poem, To His Excellency Lord Carteret: The Humble Petition of Lord Viscount Mount Cashel (Dublin, 1725). See Hogan and Mell, The Poems of Patrick Delany, 125-40.
panegyric occasioned a poetic reply from Swift, *An Epistle upon an Epistle from a certain Doctor to a certain great Lord: Being a Christmas-Box for D. D[ela]ny*, which gently ridiculed the clergyman for requesting further preferment when he already had a living in County Fermanagh, the Chancellorship of Christ Church, a prebend’s stall in St. Patrick’s, and a lecturing position in Trinity:

Take this advice then from your friend,  
To your ambition put an end.  
Be frugal, Pat; pay what you owe  
Before you ‘build’ and you ‘bestow.’  
Be modest, nor address your betters  
With begging, vain, familiar letters.  

Carteret’s popularity among literary circles was also attested by the numerous broadsheets, pamphlets and dedications that poured from the Dublin presses. Various genres of literature, from serious philosophical works such as Francis Hutcheson’s *An Inquiry into the Original of Our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue* (1726) to historical plays such as Robert Ashton’s *The Battle of Aughrim* (1728), were dedicated to Lord Carteret during his viceroyalty. Hutcheson’s *Inquiry* pleased him so much that he took great trouble to discover the author and befriend him. Hutcheson remarked how ‘’twill ever be matter of the highest Joy and Satisfaction to me, that I am Author of a Book my Lord Carteret approves’. Carteret’s ‘favourable Reception of the [Inquiry] soon put me out of all Fears about their Success with the wiser and better Part of this World’. In the preface to his play, Ashton was more effusive, extolling Carteret’s ‘shining Character’, which ‘embolden’d [him] to undertake this Play, wherein the Honour of several of your Lordship’s countrymen are very nearly concern’d, that your Excellency may therefore with your Illustrious Consort and Your

---

31 Williams, *Carteret and Newcastle*, 90.  
Shining Off-Spring be the lasting Glories of Posterity and Shine in the remotest Annals of the Earth’.34 In the prologue, Ashton continued the praise: ‘May Hibernia long enjoy a Friend, / Like Him to shelter, govern, and defend.’35

Carteret’s absences also became the subject of verse in Dublin.36 One such example, Upon the News of His Excellency the Lord Carteret’s Return for Ireland (Dublin, 1727), casts Carteret’s return to Ireland as that of a triumphant Greek hero: ‘Let Dublin smile, be glad ye Sons of Men, / Rejoyce, O Ireland, Carteret, comes again!’37 Like all viceroys, Carteret returned to England for periods of time. However, unlike most of his predecessors and successors, who generally hurried back to England as soon as the Irish session was over, he spent far more of his time in Ireland than was customary.38 For literary hopefuls seeking support, Carteret’s presence in Dublin promised financial rewards. Anonymously printed broadsheets appeared with sycophantic verse dedications to the viceroy. These poems hitherto have been overlooked. It is worth presenting a sample here, as they provide a sense of Carteret’s effect on literary and scholarly circles in Dublin at this time. In the poem, Speech. To his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, and Lady Carteret. On their Late Arrival. Paraphras’d (Dublin, 1727) the anonymous satirist comically presents the image of a ‘Little Poet’ dancing a hornpipe in an eager attempt to capture the viceroy’s attention at Dublin Castle:

But that your Little Poet, I,
With joys abounding
You still Surrounding
In my Flights, will soar above the sky.
And in my Dancing,
And in my Prancing,

35 Ashton, ‘Prologue’, The Battle of Aughrim, i.
36 In the poem, Departure. To His Excellence, Lord Carteret, the poet observes how ‘Hibernia’s Sons Great Carteret deplore, / And in sad Pomp conduct him to the Shore.’ Departure. To His Excellence, Lord Carteret. A Poem (Dublin, 1726), 1.
37 Upon the News of His Excellency the Lord Carteret’s Return for Ireland (Dublin, 1727), 1.
38 Two of Carteret’s predecessors — Sunderland and Townshend — never set foot in Ireland at all. Williams, Carteret and Newcastle, 76.
If Heretofore
On Castle floor
I got th’Encore
With small Desert
I’ll break my Heart
But I’ll bounce higher
The Ceiling Nigher
And in my Hornpipes,
Danc’d to Cornpipes.39

Another anonymous broadsheet, P[rovost] and S[enior] Fe[llow]s of T[rinit]y C[olleg]e Dublin, their A[ddres]s to The L[ord] C[arteret] etc. (Dublin, 1727), satirically exposes the pretensions of clergymen at Trinity College, Dublin, who present themselves as ‘loyal Hearts’ with an eye towards personal advancement:

[They] Come hither deckt in Scarlet Garments,
Not to mention for Preferments;
Tho’ some may say, ’twas that we went for,
Because we came to you unsent for,
Thus some may say, no matter who ’tis,
Thus we in verbum Sacerdotis
But come (as you may understand)
Purely to kiss your Lordship’s Hand,
And testify our Great Affection
For your unweary’d Circumspection
And Care in all Affairs, concerning
Our little Commonwealth of Learning [... ]40

Yet another broadsheet, The Little Beaus [sic] Petition, was more vociferous in satirising the writing frenzy which occurred shortly after Carteret’s arrival in Ireland.41 This comically turned verse parodied its speaker’s lack of erudition, which is presented as a frustrating impediment to attracting Carteret’s attention:

40 P[rovost] and S[enior] Fe[llow]s of T[rinit]y C[olleg]e, Dublin, their A[ddres]s to The L[ord] C[arteret] (Dublin, 1727), 1. On 2 May 1730, Swift wrote to Pope: ‘There is a knot of little fellows here either in the University or among the younger Clergy, who deal in verse and sometimes shrewdly enough. These have been pestering Dr Delany for several Months past, but how they have been provoked I know not, unless by envy at seeing him so very domestick with the Lord Lieut. The Doctor as a man of much strictness in his Life was terribly mortifed with two or three of the first Squibbs, but now his Gall is broke.’ Swift Corr. 3: 309.
41 The Little Beaus Petition to His Ex[cellency] the L[ord], C[arteret]. Against the young Ladies of Dublin (Dublin, 1728), 1.
'Tis true my Lord I cannot Speak
Nor understand your Heathen Greek
Nor like a Scholar can bring pat in
A Sentence of that Gibrish Latin.\textsuperscript{42}

This small sample of broadsheet dedications to the viceroy reflects the excitement generated by the Carteret administration in Dublin. Carteret, through his concerted effort to reform Ireland’s desperate economic situation, was seen to have, as Swift ironically termed it, ‘a genteeeler method of binding the chains of the kingdom’ than previous viceroys,\textsuperscript{43} but it was his interest in books, art, theatre and, moreover, his willingness to support aspiring writers financially that made him an ideal patron in Dublin.

\textit{Barber’s verse to Lord Carteret}

Barber’s dedicatory poem, \textit{To His Excellency the Lord Carteret, Occasioned by Seeing a Poem Intitled The Birth of Manly Virtue}, demonstrates her early literary ambition and reflects her awareness of the distinct relationship between poetry and patronage. In order to interpret how Barber used this poem to court Lord Carteret’s patronage, it is necessary to first understand how her poetic dedication responds to two other poems which were printed anonymously in Dublin that same year (see Appendix 1). The first, \textit{The Birth of Manly Virtue}, from Callimachus has since been attributed to Patrick Delany who sought patronage from Carteret throughout the viceroy’s tenure in Ireland.\textsuperscript{44} Delany’s poem was a revised translation of the original \textit{Birth of Manly Virtue}, written by the third-century BC Greek poet

\textsuperscript{42} The Little Beaus Petition, 1.
\textsuperscript{43} Swift, \textit{Corr.} 3: 275.
\textsuperscript{44} James Woolley has convincingly argued for Delany’s authorship in ‘The Canon of Swift’s Poems: The Case of ‘An Apology to Lady Carteret,’’ in \textit{Reading Swift}, ed. Richard H. Rodino and Hermann Real (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1993), 255. Hogan has also observed that this conventional poetic laudation of Carteret was much more in the preferment-seeking Delany’s manner than in Swift’s. Hogan and Mell, \textit{Poems of Patrick Delany}, 99.
and Hellenistic scholar, Callimachus (ca. 265 BC).\textsuperscript{45} A fulsome eulogy, Delany’s poem praises the personification of ‘Manly Virtue’ as male heir to the gods, who, by his example of scholarship and discipline, is sent to ‘bless and mend the earth’, excel at learning, resist temptation and win every soul and heart with his ‘powerful voice’ and ‘graceful mien’.\textsuperscript{46} The second poem, \textit{Inscribed to the Author of The Birth of Manly Virtue}, celebrated Delany’s translation of \textit{The Birth of Manly Virtue} as an original and ingenious reading of the existing Callimachus text:

\begin{quote}
Hail happy Bard, who durst explore  
A path, which Muse ne’er trac’d before:  
A path would better show a God  
Than e’en Callimachus e’er trod!\textsuperscript{47}
\end{quote}

The final couplet congratulated the translator on the suitable pairing of Lord Carteret and ‘Virtue’: ‘Wondrous the Work! But true the theme / Virtue and Carteret are the same.’\textsuperscript{48}

It was most likely that the second anonymous poem was written by another of Delany’s circle. The celebration of Carteret, virtue and Delany’s translation is indicative of the self-referential style of this circle who wrote poems to each other. To date, it has not been conclusively assigned to any one individual. Hogan, who includes the verse in his collection of Delany’s poems, with other poems by Sheridan and Swift, has not attributed the poem to either Swift or Sheridan and indeed, the poem’s style, with its repetitive phrases and sycophancy, does not readily suggest either poet’s invention. Constantia Grierson is one possibility. Grierson knew Delany through her husband, the printer and bookseller, George Grierson. George Grierson was printer of choice for Delany’s translation of \textit{The Birth of

\textsuperscript{45} Callimachus was a scholar poet of Libyan-Greek origin. He wrote more than 800 hymns and a collection of legends, but he is best known for his short poems and epigrams. He enjoyed the patronage of ancient Egyptian pharaohs Ptolemy II and Ptolemy III. See \textit{The Oxford Dictionary of the Classical World} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

\textsuperscript{46} Hogan and Mell, \textit{Poems of Patrick Delany}, 94-99.

\textsuperscript{47} Hogan and Mell, \textit{Poems of Patrick Delany}, 102.

\textsuperscript{48} Hogan and Mell, \textit{Poems of Patrick Delany}, 103.
Manly Virtue, and a further dedication by Delany to Lord Carteret in 1729. Constantia was publicly acclaimed for her knowledge and love of the classics; she wrote poetry in Latin, Greek and English. Two of those poems are dedicated to the Carterets; and Constantia dedicated the Dublin editions of Tacitus (1720) and Terence (1727) to Lord Carteret and his son. However, Elias argued how ‘Constantia did not much care to be read, or at least to be personally appreciated, beyond her circle of friends’. Most of her energies went into her classical translations. Her premature death in 1732, at the age of twenty-seven, ensured that she would be remembered primarily as a scholar. In her preface to her Poems, Barber also noted how Grierson left few copies of her verse behind. This, combined with Grierson’s apparent modesty and reported feeling that several of her poetical pieces were substandard, meant that only a handful of her poems survive (for a fuller discussion of Constantia Grierson, see Chapter 2). However, it is unlikely that she authored the anonymous poem. The phraseology of this poem is incongruous when read alongside other known Grierson poems, which are readily identifiable by their religious and/or philosophical fervour.

Eliminating Swift, Sheridan, Delany, Barber and Grierson leaves us with the possibility of either Matthew or Laetitia Pilkington. The date of the poem’s publication (1725) corresponds to the Pilkingtons’ arrival into Delany’s circle. Constantia Grierson, whom Laetitia had known since 1721, was responsible for introducing the (recently married) Pilkingtons. According to Laetitia, Constantia informed Delany of the cruel treatment of Laetitia’s mother towards the couple and brought Laetitia’s poems to Delany to read. Both

49 George Grierson also printed Delany’s dedication, An Epistle to his Excellency John Lord Carteret (Dublin, 1729). The poem was several times reprinted in pamphlet form. See Hogan and Mell, Poems of Patrick Delany, 127.
51 For further discussion of Grierson’s verse style see Elias, ‘Manuscript Book of Constantia Grierson’s’.
52 Elias, Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington, 1: 389.
Matthew and Laetitia wrote panegyrical verse similar to this anonymous poem. Yet it is notable that this poem does not appear in Matthew Pilkington’s *Poems on Several Occasions* (1730). The Latin inscription which heads the anonymous poem (identified by Hogan as coming from Book 1 of the Roman poet and philosopher, Lucretius’s *De rerum naturae*) also points to the possibility of Laetitia Pilkington’s authorship. While Matthew Pilkington makes use of conventional classical imagery in his verse (such as in ‘To Lycidas in the Country’), Laetitia engaged in classical translation, as evidenced by her poems ‘Ode in Imitation of Horace’ and ‘The Seventh Ode of the Third Book of Horace paraphrased. Written in the Absence of her Husband.’ However, it is the evidence of style which most persuasively suggests Laetitia’s authorship. Most striking is the syntactical resemblance between the opening lines of the anonymous poem — ‘Hail, happy, Bard, who durst explore / A path, which Muse ne’er traced before’ – and Laetitia’s *Delville the Seat of the Rev. Dr. Delany*: ‘Hail, happy Delville! Blissful Seat! / The Muses’ best belov’d Retreat!’ Furthermore, words such as ‘groves’, ‘flowers’, ‘limpid streams’, and ‘fountains’ recur throughout Laetitia’s verse. The verb ‘polish’, used in *A Poem Inscrib’d* (line 19), appears twice in Laetitia’s poem, ‘Delville, the Seat of the Rev. Doctor Delany’ (line 13), and ‘The Statues: or, the Trial of Constancy, A Tale for the Ladies’ (line 27). So, too, the verb ‘burnish’, seen in *A Poem Inscrib’d* (line 19) also appears in ‘The Statues’ (line 30). The adjective ‘limpid’ appears twice in ‘The Statues’ (line 191) and ‘Mallow Waters’ (line 20).

---


54 The Loeb Classical Library translation by W. H. D. Rouse reads: ‘now in lively thought I traverse pathless tracts of the Pierides never yet trodden by any foot. I love to approach virgin springs and there to drink; I love to pluck fresh flowers, and to see an illustrious chaplet for my head from fields whence ere this the Muses have crowned the brows of none.’ Lucretius: *On the Nature of Things*, trans. W. H. D. Rouse (Harvard: Loeb Classical Library, 1924), 69 (lines 925-930).


Finally, the phrase ‘ray divine’, used in *A Poem Inscrib’d* (line 20) also appears in Laetitia’s poem, ‘Sorrow’ (line 21). These words do not appear at all in either Matthew Pilkington or Constantia Grierson’s verse.

Barber’s dedication to Lord Carteret takes elements from both Delany’s translation and (as I see it) Laetitia Pilkington’s poem and fuses them together to create her own eulogy to the viceroy. In *A Poem Inscrib’d*, the medium of paint is employed to distinguish between insipid forgery and the brilliance of the translator’s (Delany’s) rendering of Greek eulogy:

> Others imagine they excel,  
> If they can only copy well,  
> Or paint a grove, or lover’s dream,  
> A flow’ry mead, or limpid stream.  
> Thou, from thy native depth of thought  
> Hast goodliest ore to polish wrought,  
> Burnished the mass and bid it shine. With brilliant beam and ray divine.  

According to ‘Pilkington’, the translator of *The Birth of Manly Virtue* has effectively remodelled the original text to create a wholly accurate and imaginative interpretation of virtue. He has not merely managed a skilful imitation of the observable world, but brilliantly decoded a universal ideal. In turn, Barber acknowledges this and makes painting the central motif of her response:

> The Picture strikes — ’tis drawn with wondrous Art;  
> Well has the Poet play’d the Painter’s Part.  
> Tho’ ’tis your Glory, yet, my Lord, I own,  
> I grieve the Features fit yourself alone.  

The painting motif in Barber’s poem is developed by setting the limits of portraiture against poetry’s more extensive capacity. Taking the example of court painter Sir Godfrey Kneller’s depiction of classical beauty, ‘Clarinda’, Barber opposes the transient effect of physical

---

58 Barber, *Poems*, 118.
beauty, with its inherent manipulative power, to Carteret’s integrity and learning, which, Barber claims, is eternal:

When Kneller has display’d with matchless Grace,
The fleeting Glories of Clarinda’s Face;
She sighs to think how time will soon devour
The lovely Bloom which gave her now such Pow’r.
But yours, a Likeness of a nobler Kind,
Displays the deathless Beauties of the Mind. 59

As the king’s sole Principal Painter from Riley’s death in 1691, Kneller produced numerous acclaimed portraits of many of the leading figures of the day, including Lord and Lady Carteret. 60 Barber’s choice of Kneller’s ‘Clarinda’ (a classical representation of beauty) may initially appear a somewhat incongruous image for Carteret. However, by selecting a representation of female beauty and power, Barber is able to expose the superficiality and ephemerality of the purely visual image. She notes that, while Clarinda’s ‘Bloom’ will inevitably fade along with her sighs, Carteret’s credibility and scholarship — in short, his ‘likeness of a Nobler kind’ — is imperishable. Barber’s opposition of Clarinda’s temporal beauty to Carteret’s integrity highlights a complex play between the mediums of poetry and portraiture, in which poetry (according to Barber) emerges as the superior art form. While Clarinda’s painted visage confers visual power, the poetic representation of Lord Carteret will surpass and outlast the painted picture: ‘Be it your glory to surpass the paint / And make the finished picture look too faint.’ 61 Thus, Barber suggests that poetry can capture what cannot be translated onto canvas. By advocating the superiority of poetry to visual art, Barber further proposes that poetry is also the more worthy of patronage (ironic, considering that her

59 Barber, Poems, 118.
60 Sir Godfrey Kneller’s portraits of the viceregal couple are currently held in the Yellow Satin Room at Ham House, Richmond-upon-Thames. For reproductions of Kneller’s portraits of the Carteret family see Mrs. Charles Roundell, Ham House: Its History and Art Treasures, 2 vols (London: George Bell and Sons, 1904), 2: 77.
61 Barber, Poems, 118.
son, Rupert, would later become a miniaturist and portrait artist, producing four profile portraits of Swift). This demonstrates Barber’s awareness of how the terms of patronage could be manipulated. Her reference to painting reflects the aesthetic interests of her patrons.

In theory, portraits were a symbol of cultural, financial and social wealth and were treasured for their aristocratic and ancestral associations. Typically, they were displayed in the sitter’s home to advertise the magnificence of their ancestors, allies, friends and patrons. Thus, the acquisition of paintings and portraits grew amongst the middling and upper classes in England. On the other hand, print culture facilitates much wider dissemination than painting. Moreover, Barber understood that for a patron-client relationship to exist, both patron and poet must be identifiable. The painter is easily distinguished by brush stroke and signature on the canvas; an anonymously printed poem has the disadvantage of rendering its author invisible. Barber takes from Delany’s translation, in which the figure of ‘Manly Virtue’ claims that true Merit should be made visible and vice should be concealed: ‘Give fraudulent Vice the mask and screen, / ’Tis Virtue’s int’rest to be seen.’

In the final stanza of the poem, Barber calls for the identification and acknowledgement of the translator of The Birth of Manly Virtue:

Why is he hid, who, with such matchless Art,
Calls forth the Graces that adorn your Heart?
True Poets in their deathless Lays should live,
And share that Immortality they give.

---

62 According to McMinn, Rupert Barber produced four profile portraits of Swift, three in crayon, one in miniature. Through his mother’s influence at the Deanery, Barber was able to observe Swift while he was under the medical care of guardians. Barber even had posthumous access to Swift, whose body was laid out in an open casket in the Deanery for three days, during which time Barber took quick sketches of the Dean’s profile. See Joseph McMinn, ‘Images of Devotion: Swift and Portraits’, Irish Architectural and Decorative Studies: The Journal of the Irish Georgian Society 8 (Dublin: Irish Georgian Society, 2005): 161-85, 175-78. See also Marks, ‘Seeking an Enduring Image’, 31-82.

63 Hogan and Mell, Poems of Patrick Delany, 97.

64 Barber, Poems, 118.
Fig. 1. ‘John Lord Carteret’, from the painting by Sir Godfrey Kneller, ca. 1720. Reproduced in Mrs. Charles Roundell, *Ham House: Its History and Art Treasures*, 2: 77.
Barber here reinforces the reciprocal nature of the ideal patronage relationship, in which poet and patron have a joint share in everlasting fame. This highlights an important part of the patronage exchange: that immortality is not the sole preserve of the patron. ‘Rank may be conferred by princes,’ says Johnson, ‘and wealth bequeathed by misers or by robbers; but the honours of a lasting name and the veneration of distant ages only the sons of learning have the power of bestowing.’ Barber calls for recognition of Delany and, by implication, her own poem. This call may be seen as an ambitious first step toward creating her poetical and public reputation in Dublin.

This poem also marks an important first stage in Barber’s entrée into the Dublin literary sphere. Ostensibly, her dedication was addressed to Lord Carteret; however, the poem had the indirect, added advantage of pulling her into the literary circle of Delany and Swift. The poem highlights how Delany was as important an ally to Barber as Lord Carteret, or even Swift. The importance of Swift’s coterie of women and his engagement with women authors has been well documented. Swift acted as a mentor to this group, a chairman of the Senatus Consultum, who gave advice on verse. However, this focus on Swift’s patronage, particularly of the women authors in the circle, obscures the early influence of Patrick Delany. Swift’s connections with Barber were erratic. The first evidence of Barber’s literary correspondence with Swift occurs as late as 1726, when she dedicated a birthday verse to him: ‘On sending my Son, as a Present, to Dr. Swift, Dean of St. Patrick’s, on his Birth Day’. Swift’s first mention of Barber is not until 1728 when, in a letter to John Gay, he noted that he had asked her to amend her poem, A True Tale, and change the encomium to Dryden, which Barber

67 The poem is dated ‘November 30, 1726’ in Barber’s Poems, 26.
refused to do. It is not until February 1729 that we have the first mention of Swift’s sobriquet, ‘Triumfeminate’, for the literary trio of Barber, Constantia Grierson and Elizabeth Sican. This was four years after the publication of Delany’s translation and Barber’s poetic dedication to Carteret. While Swift was instrumental in forging subscription connections for Barber in London, he was noticeably less supportive during Barber’s suspected forgery of a letter to Queen Caroline in 1731, maintaining his distance until Barber was acquitted of involvement (see Chapter 4 for a full discussion of this incident).

On the other hand, Delany and Barber had been acquainted since 1719. As outlined in my introduction, Barber’s husband, Rupert, served as witness to Patrick Delany and Dr. Richard Helsham’s original lease to Delville house in Glasnevin in 1719. The Barbers later lived on the Delville grounds and their son, Rupert, married Delany’s niece, who also lived on the property. This was ten years earlier than Barber’s first known association with Swift. In Dublin, Delany was a notable literary figure amongst the cultural élite. Between his Stafford Street home in the city and his country villa at Delville in Glasnevin, he gathered around him a circle of literary enthusiasts, all of whom took a lively and intelligent interest in books, poetry, music and art. However, his interest in culture was not confined to distinguished men. Perhaps the most notable element of his translation of the Callimachus

71 Barber’s communal residence with Delany was mentioned in Swift’s Epistle upon an Epistle (Dublin, 1730), Thomas Sheridan’s An Answer to the Christmas-Box – In Defence of Doctor Delany, By R[uper]t B[arbe]r (Dublin, 1729) and another anonymously published broadside, A Letter of Advice to the Reverend Dr. D[e]lany, Humbly Proposed to the Consideration of a Certain Great Lord (Dublin, 1730). According to Swift’s Epistle upon an Epistle, Delany had originally found a ‘convenient Box’ at Delville which he demolished; ‘Then Built, then took up your Arbour, / And set the House to R-p-t B-br.’ So, what must have originally been a convenient suburban getaway for the Barbers – we know they lived in Werburgh Street 1705 through at least 1724 – eventually became a permanent residence. See Elias, Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington, 2: 391-92. Sheridan’s An Answer to the Christmas-Box is attributed in its title to Rupert Barber, husband of Mary Barber; however, Hogan notes that the attribution is probably a joke, for Delany had let part of Delville to Barber. The anonymous broadside also mentions him: ‘Let Barber, though polite, at counter wait; No longer be caressed in pomp and state [...]’ This could refer to Rupert Barber, who owned a woollen business, but it could also mean Mary Barber, who was known to help her husband in his business. Hogan and Mell, Poems of Patrick Delany, 129-40.
72 Ehrenpreis, Swift, 3: 634-35.
poem is the powerfully suggestive example to patrons in supporting excellence in both men *and* women, just as the male figure of ‘Manly Virtue’ enhances his reputation by recognising and supporting the female personification of ‘Merit’:

Thus acting what he taught so well,
He drew dumb Merit from her cell,
Led with amazing art along
The bashful dame and loosed her tongue;
And whilst he made her value known,
Yet more displayed and raised his own.\(^73\)

Delany, who encouraged the literary aspirations of Barber, Pilkington and Grierson, could easily have been interpreting his own role in this circle. Writing to Alexander Pope in 1731, Swift elaborated on Delany’s pivotal role as Barber’s sponsor in Dublin: ‘Dr Delany hath been long her Protector, and being many years my acquaintance, desired my good offices for her & brought her several times to the Deanery.’\(^74\) Delany remained an important ally to Barber throughout her literary endeavours. As I will demonstrate in Chapter 4, he was instrumental in acquitting Barber of her alleged hand in the forged letter to Queen Caroline in 1731. His later personal associations were also significant to Barber: Mary Pendarves (who met Delany in 1730 and would later marry him in 1743), was an influential and steadfast friend throughout Barber’s life. Samuel Richardson — who was responsible for the printing of Barber’s *Poems* in London — corresponded regularly with Delany (especially in relation to his novel *The History of Sir Charles Grandison*) and printed several of his works in London during a period between the 1730s and 1750s (for more on Richardson and Delany’s printing connection see Chapter 5).\(^75\)

---

\(^73\) Hogan and Mell, *Poems of Patrick Delany*, 97.

\(^74\) Swift to Pope, 6 February 1729/30: ‘They are all three great Friends and Favourites of Dr. Delany.’ Swift, *Corr.*, 3: 411.

\(^75\) For more on Richardson-Delany correspondence during this period see, *The Correspondence of Samuel Richardson, author of Pamela, Clarissa, and Sir Charles Grandison: Selected from the original manuscripts, bequeathed to him by his family, to which are prefixed, a biographical account of that author, and observations on his writings*, ed. Anna Laetitia Barbauld, 6 vols (London, 1804), vol. 4. Louise Curran, ‘Into Whosever Hands Our Letters Might Fall’: Samuel Richardson’s Correspondence and the Public Eye’, *Eighteenth-Century Life* 35.1 (Winter 2011): 51-64.
Barber’s poetic dedication to Carteret demonstrates her early awareness of the mechanics of poetry and patronage. Unlike the cloying or satiric broadsheet dedications to the viceroy, Barber’s poetic debut was a highly ambitious poem, both effective and intertextual. Her determination to establish poetry as a superior art form enabled her to celebrate Carteret as the source of art and inspiration, and Delany as the translator of that source. This made for a compelling appeal to both patrons, but it also demonstrates how poetry enabled several connections to be made at once. This shift from a traditional, single patron-client relationship to multiple sources of support prefigures Barber’s later subscription process.

**Barber’s patronage relationship with Lady Carteret**

Barber’s poetic addresses to Lady Carteret and her daughter Grace were important for the formation of her literary voice. Lady Frances Carteret (daughter of Sir Robert Worsley and Lady Frances Worsley and granddaughter to the first Viscount Weymouth) married Lord Carteret in 1710, at her mother’s home, Longleat, Wiltshire.\(^{76}\) Like her husband, Lady Carteret enjoyed something of a gilded reputation on both sides of the Irish Sea. A society toast as a young woman in England, she made a favourable impression on social circles in Dublin by fostering key friendships with the powerful Conolly dynasty of Castletown and with Mary Pendarves (Lord Carteret’s cousin and later wife of Patrick Delany). Later, Mary Delany would contrast the Duchess of Dorset with Lady Carteret in social terms: ‘Lady Carteret used to have balls once a week, but they brought so great a crowd that the Duchess, who is of a quiet spirit, will avoid them.’\(^{77}\)

---

\(^{76}\) Cannon, ‘Carteret, John, second Earl Granville (1690–1763)’.

Fig. 2. ‘Lady Carteret’ from the painting by Sir Godfrey Kneller, ca. 1720. Reproduced in Mrs. Charles Roundell, *Ham House: Its History and Art Treasures* (London, 1904), 2: 77.
Swift was also an admirer. In a letter to Lady Worsley he wrote: ‘My Lady Carteret hath been the best Queen we have known in Ireland these many years.’ Poetic dedications to Lady Carteret highlight her importance as a patron in Dublin. These included playful riddles, such as those by Delany and Swift. Swift’s *An Apology to the Lady Carteret* (1730) praised the vicerine as: ‘A Lady Wise, as well Fair, / Whose Conscience always was her care.’ Thomas Sheridan’s *An Epistle on Behalf of Our Irish Poets. To the Right Hon. Lady Carteret* (1726) argued that the Lady Carteret could take himself, ‘punning Tom Sh[e][r][i][d][a][n]’, and whichever other Irish poets she desired, to London with her, but that Dublin ‘would be perfectly undone’ without Swift and Delany.

Further poems were dedicated to the Carterets’ eldest daughter, Grace, who was eleven when she accompanied her parents to Dublin. Her childish beauty was the subject of several Irish poems by those who aspired to the viceroy’s attention. One example is Ambrose Philips (1674–1749), an English pastoral poet, who, in an attempt to ingratiate himself with the viceroy, addressed Grace in *A Poem to the Honourable Miss Carteret* (Dublin, 1725). The poem was written in an affected and insipid nursery style. Lines such as ‘Thou, thy parents pride and care, / Fairest offspring of the fair’ and ‘When again the lambkins play, / Pretty sportlings, full of May’, failed to impress rival poets and playwrights. His estranged friend, Swift, joined in the derisive laughter which greeted the poem’s (unauthorised) appearance in broadsheet form on the streets of Dublin in 1725. Many entertaining parodies of Philips’s poems appeared, the most memorable which is by Henry Carey, a prolific miscellaneous writer who was in Dublin at this time. Carey was the first to put it into print the name that

---

79 Swift, *An Apology to the Lady Carteret on Her Inviting Dean Swift to Dinner* (Dublin, 1730); Patrick Delany, *A riddle by the Rev. Doctor Delany, inscrib’d to the Lady Carteret* (Dublin, 1726); Swift, *A Riddle by Dr Swift, to the Lady Carteret* (Dublin, 1726).
81 Hogan and Mell, *The Poems of Patrick Delany*, 165.
82 Philips was an ‘intimate’ friend of Swift in London between 1707 and 1710. By 1724, the time he came to Ireland as secretary to Hugh Boulter, Archbishop of Armagh, he and Swift were estranged (for reasons of politics and personality). Andrew Varney, ‘Philips, Ambrose (bap. 1674, d. 1749),’ *ODNB*, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22119 (accessed 24 August 2013).
Philips’s detractors coined for him, ‘Namby Pamby’, representing a child’s efforts to say his name. In the poem *Namby-Pamby*, ca. 1725: ‘That her father’s gracy grace, / Might give him a placy place.’

Barber also dedicated a poem to Grace, but the poem’s mode of approach is different to the nursery style of Philips’s poem. In a short, eight-line stanza, Barber appealed to the Carterets’ daughter Grace to help an impoverished widow in Dublin. In this poem, Barber endeavours to persuade Grace to eschew the shallow preoccupation with physical beauty and instead embrace the nobler pursuit of giving charity:

Fair Innocence the Muse’s loveliest Theme  
On Acts of Mercy found thy rising Fame  
Let Others from frail Beauty hope Applause,  
Plead Thou the Fatherless, and Widow’s Cause;  
Fly to your Mother, let each winning Grace  
Engage Compassion for my helpless Race:  
So shall the wond’ring World be taught from thence.  
Beauty is but your *Second* Excellence.  

In lines which echo Barber’s dedication to Lord Carteret, Barber advises her that prestige and power do not come from physical beauty but from compassion. Barber encourages Grace to become a type of social educator, enlightening the ‘wond’ring World’ not by her physical attributes but by her charitable deeds on behalf of the ‘helpless Race’ of widows and women who have been compromised by a lack of protection and poverty.

Barber’s dedication to Lady Carteret, *The Widow’s Address to the Right Hon. the Lady Carteret* took the form of a petition on behalf of a recently impoverished army officer’s widow, who is identified as ‘Widow Gordon’ in Barber’s *Poems*. There is no conclusive evidence for the identification of ‘Widow Gordon’. Barber’s Preface, which acknowledges a

---

84 Barber, *Poems*, 1-2.  
85 The petition was printed by Cornelius Carter in Dublin in 1725 as *The Widow’s Address to the Right Hon. the Lady Carteret*. By M.B. It was later included in Barber’s *Poems* under the slightly modified title ‘The Widow Gordon’s Petition: To the Right Honourable the Lady Carteret’. Hereafter, I use the title ‘The Widow Gordon’s Petition’ as printed in Barber’s *Poems*, 2-5.
‘considerable Sum’ being raised for the widow’s relief, suggests that she was a real person.\textsuperscript{86} As the wife of an impoverished wool-draper with four dependent children (another five had died in infancy), Barber likely understood the stern economic and social considerations ‘Widow Gordon’ experienced.

Written in the widow’s voice, the poem creates a compelling narrative of subjugation and poverty. The poem depicts the widow’s grief over her children’s ‘piercing Cries for Bread’; her son’s blindness, which ‘rob(s) him of his only Joy, the Light’.\textsuperscript{87} The widow’s ‘greatest Dread’ is the pressing threat of imprisonment: ‘My mournful Story will no more prevail, / And ev’ry Hour I dread a dismal Jail.’\textsuperscript{88} Dublin’s Newgate, and the Bridewell prisons were notorious for overcrowding and confinement.\textsuperscript{89} Reports of these jails speak of the overwhelming stench; most people succumbed to the prevalence of ‘gaol fever’ — a form of typhus — before they came to trial.\textsuperscript{90} The condition of the jails was mirrored in the calibre of the jailers, who, according to \textit{The Historical Register}, were corrupt and depraved to such a

\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{86} Barber, \textit{Poems}, xviii. According to Charles Dalton, there is a record of an Alex Gordon, ‘ensign’, a member of the Scots Establishment (9 June 1716), who later that same year became the sole Deputy Commissary of the Musters in Scotland. If this is the husband of ‘Widow Gordon’ in Barber’s petition, it could explain why Barber appealed to both Lady Carteret and her eldest daughter, Grace. In 1729, Grace Carteret married Sir Lionel Tollemache, fourth Earl of Dysart. Dysart, in the county of Fife, lies a few miles from Edinburgh. Although there is a four year discrepancy between Barber’s petition and the date of the Grace’s marriage to Lionel Tollemache, it was not unusual for aristocratic families to formally arrange or encourage marriages between children to secure possessions and estates until they came of age. Thus, although the connection is tenuous, it is possible that Barber was appealing to the interests and sympathies of the Carterets. See Charles Dalton, \textit{George I’s Army, 1714-1727}, 2 vols (London: Eyre and Spottiswode, 1910), 1: 200. See also, Mrs Charles Roundell, \textit{Ham House}, 2: 77.

\textsuperscript{87} Barber, \textit{Poems}, 2.

\textsuperscript{88} Barber, \textit{Poems}, 4.

\textsuperscript{89} Newgate Prison was located at Cornmarket, near Christ Church Cathedral and originally one of the city gates. Bridewell Prison, built to relieve pressure on Newgate Prison was located on the site of Griffith’s Barracks, a former military barracks on the South Circular Road, Dublin. See Christine Casey, \textit{The Buildings of Ireland: Dublin} (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), 645; John Gilbert Thomas, \textit{A History of the City of Dublin} (Dublin: John McGlashan, 1854), 257.

\end{flushright}
degree that they appear to have differed little from some of their charges.  

By contrast to the widow’s hopeless predicament, Barber depicts Lady Carteret’s compassion for the welfare of the oppressed and tyrannised in a partisan society. In her Preface, Barber relates that Lady Carteret shared her husband’s enthusiasm for social reform in Ireland: ‘that excellent Lady interested herself with so much Zeal for the distressed Widow, that a considerable Sum was raised for her Relief.’ In the petition, Lady Carteret is characterised as a saintly heroine, heralded as ‘the Wretch’s last resort’ and the final hope for those ‘Weary’d with long attendance on the Court’. As a result of her ‘Angel Goodness’, Lady Carteret will enjoy the ‘Fulness of Coelestial Joys’ and be given a ‘Crown of Glory’. In this way, Lady Carteret is imbued with virtuous qualities and flattered into helping the widow. In her Preface, Barber uses Lady Carteret as a ‘Noble Example to those in Exalted Stations, not only to give, but never to think themselves too Great to solicit for the unfortunate.’ According to Dustin Griffin, there was a universal sense in this period that the wealthy and powerful had an ‘obligation’ to support those in need. This moral foundation of ‘gift-giving’ was recovered from the classical Senecan tradition of ‘benificence’ in which authors crediting the patron with fashionable virtues and motives would in return be granted favours, protection, and help. This poem presented Barber with an opportunity to remind her potential patrons of their obligation to support those in need, a duty which is ‘not only a

---

91 According to The Historical Register, ‘Once in Jail, authorities purposefully allowed imprisoned felons to torment less dangerous prisoners. In 1730, debtors in the ‘Nunnery’, the black dungeon in Dublin’s Newgate Prison, witnessed ‘that frequently fourteen, and sometimes twenty Persons have in one Night been there crowded together, and have been robb’d and abus’d by Criminals thrown in (as they conceiv’d) on purpose to make their Misery still more insufferable.’ The Historical Register 15 (London, 1730): 101. See also Laurie Throness, A Protestant Purgatory: Theological Origins of the Penitentiary Act of 1779 (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008).
92 Barber, Poems, xvii.
93 Barber, Poems, 2.
94 Barber, Poems, 4-5.
95 Barber, Poems, xix.
97 Seneca’s De beneficiis elaborates the art of patronage, or of securing grateful obedience; this comprises the art of gracious giving and grateful receiving: ‘If a benefit is acknowledged, it is returned ... He who receives a benefit gladly has already returned it.’ Seneca, De beneficiis, 3: 113. Quoted in Griffin, Literary Patronage in England, 5. See also Edward Andrew, ‘The Senecan Moment: Patronage and Philosophy in the Eighteenth Century’, Journal of the History of Ideas 65 (2004): 277-99.
Thus, it is a patron’s compassion and generosity — not her status or wealth — that is worthy of fame and recognition: ‘This Fame reports, Fair CARTERET of You, / This blest Report encourag’d me to sue.’ Barber’s employment of the word ‘Fame’ is significant in that it underlines the importance of public recognition as part of an effective patronage process.

Originally, both the dedication to Grace and the petition to Lady Carteret were sent as an anonymous parcel via Lord Carteret’s chief secretary, Thomas Tickell (1685–1740). Tickell, a fellow of Queen’s College, Oxford, was a protégé of Whig politician and essayist, Joseph Addison (1672–1719). In 1717, he was employed as under-secretary to Addison (then Secretary of State). When Carteret was appointed lord lieutenant in 1724, he retained Tickell as chief secretary to the lords justices. Tickell moved to Dublin in 1726 and devoted himself to official business, not literature, though he cultivated a literary friendship with Swift. Barber’s parcel of poems contained a letter and a further poem, both of which were addressed to Tickell. The letter is lost; however, Barber took care to preserve the poem, ‘Written in Conclusion of a Letter to Mr. Tickell, entreating him to recommend ‘Widow Gordon’s Petition’ and include it in her Poems. Written in her own voice, Barber’s poem to Tickell expresses frustration at her inability to ameliorate the widow’s distress: ‘Why must I feel Another’s Woes / And cannot make them less?’ Being in a position to encourage patronage, Tickell was able to effect change, unlike Barber who presents herself as being in

99 Barber, Poems, 4.
101 Tickell contributed to the Spectator and joined the group of Addison’s disciples who met regularly at Button’s Coffee House in Russell Street in London. Addison also supported Tickell’s controversial edition of the Iliad which was produced as a rival translation to Pope’s edition and published in London in 1715. Tickell, Thomas Tickell and the Eighteenth-Century Poets, 25.
102 In the autumn of 1725, Swift welcomed Tickell as ‘a guest when you please’ at the Deanery. Swift to Tickell, 12 November 1725, Swift, Corr. 3: 189.
103 Barber, Poems, 6.
position to do little:

Yet I this Torture must endure;  
’Tis not reserv’d for me,  
To ease the Sighing of the Poor,  
Or set the Pris’ners free.\textsuperscript{104}

For Barber, this petition acted as an important justification for venturing into print. In her Preface, she explains how her verse was principally written to improve and educate her children at home until, inspired by Widow Gordon’s predicament, she decided to make a public poetic appeal on the widow’s behalf:

Nor was I ever known to write upon any other Account, ’till the Distresses of an Officer’s Widow set me upon drawing a Petition in Verse, having found that other Methods had proved ineffectual for her Relief.\textsuperscript{105}

Poetry enables her to appropriate the widow’s voice to great effect. Evidently, Barber is seeking support on behalf of the widow; however, the petition also allows her to attract support for her own poetic endeavour. In her Preface, she narrates the rewarding of this strategy and how the bond of patronage extended between the supplicant author and the beneficent patron: ‘It was my Felicity, as well as the Petitioner’s to have the Petition recommended with great Generosity, and received with uncommon Goodness.’\textsuperscript{106} More specifically, Barber underlines how the poem brought her to the attention of Lady Carteret: ‘Nor did her Ladyship rest there, but endeavoured to find out the Author, whom she hath ever condescended to patronise with continual Acts of Goodness.’\textsuperscript{107} This shows how Barber’s petition was effective in attracting attention for the widow’s cause – a telling triumph, given the scores of dedications and requests visited upon the viceroyalty in Ireland at this time.\textsuperscript{108} It also shows her poem’s success in garnering patronage. The entire episode demonstrates the

\textsuperscript{104} Barber, Poems 6.
\textsuperscript{105} Barber, Poems, xviii.
\textsuperscript{106} Barber, Poems, xvii.
\textsuperscript{107} Barber, Poems, xvii.
\textsuperscript{108} Barnard has observed how, during the Carterets’ viceroyalty, ‘many were invited to the Castle, but few were accorded personal recognition.’ Barnard, Making the Grand Figure, 10.
modus operandi of literary patronage: a delicate balance of obedience and self-aggrandisement.

Barber’s modest self-positioning in these poems and her Preface has attracted critical attention. Both Betty Rizzo and Roger Lonsdale have observed how the patronage and subscription system tended (or was intended) to reward humble, deferential poets so that ‘they were effectually muzzled, incapable of developing their own voices’. Christopher Fanning has argued that Barber’s self-presentation complicates her authorial voice. In her Preface, Barber does not directly attribute the success of the petition to herself, but rather to the goodness of her recipient, Lady Carteret, who was then compelled ‘to find out the Author’. This, Fanning argues, results in Barber ‘burying her claims to merit’ in the Preface. Barber’s use of ‘Widow Gordon’ as a poetic mask, he continues, puts her at one remove from the petition, obscuring her authority. As a piece ‘ghost-written’ for the widow, the petition is at one remove from the author and this makes Barber ‘appear almost wholly passive in her authorship of this verse’. Barber’s apparently oblique method is further compounded by her decision to send the poems anonymously by way of Tickell. According to Fanning, this negatively affects the presentation of Barber’s authority and identity, creating ‘a degree of self-effacement which obscures authority’. Fanning concludes by suggesting that Barber’s compromised authority has, in effect, doomed her to obscurity as a writer.

Barber’s mode of approach certainly complicates her authority as a poet. However, a closer reading of both the Preface and the petition shows that deference and masking were deliberate strategies with which to access the Carterets and the wider public sphere. Furthermore, they served to legitimise and authorise her writing. As Paula Backscheider has observed, Barber’s petition ‘publicises what might be considered a domestic issue in a
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manner consistent with the emergence of a public sphere in which women (and men of all classes) contributed to ongoing discussions about social, military, or cultural issues.\textsuperscript{111} The petition marks a strategic transition from the maternal domestic scene, in which Barber taught her children, to the public, where she could use poetry to contribute to society. Firstly, it is not surprising that Barber attributed the success of the petition to Lady Carteret. As Griffin has shown, the construction of this type of ‘inferior’, passive persona was wholly compatible with traditional patronage etiquette, in which the patron could ‘lend his/her authority’ and assume responsibility for its contents. Women’s respect for authority did not automatically mean degradation; rather, subordination and condescension were understood as integral to both the social and the patronage structure.\textsuperscript{112} Secondly, it is important to note that her Preface — written nine years after the poem — shifts the focus away from the petition and onto Barber’s newly acquired patronage relationship with the Carteret family:

I mention this not only from a Motive of Gratitude, but likewise to encourage others to excite the Great to generous and charitable Actions; since the Author providentially found, to her Felicity, that the writing the Petition above-mention’d, gain’d her the Protection of that whole Noble Family.\textsuperscript{113}

Barber’s use of the word ‘Motive’ is revealing here. By expressing her thankfulness to the Carterets she is complying with traditional patronage exchange while simultaneously endeavouring to instruct other authors as to how the language of patronage can be manipulated to procure results. This has the added benefit of making an appeal to her readers’ charitable instincts. Barber reinforces this idea with a further example of her charitable efforts on behalf of a distressed gentlewoman at Tunbridge Wells. During her hunt for subscriptions at ‘The Wells’, Barber’s involvement in the raffle of a pair of earrings, for this woman’s

\textsuperscript{111} Paula Backscheider, \textit{British Women Poets of the Long Eighteenth Century: An Anthology} (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009), 459.
\textsuperscript{112} I refer here in particular to women writers such as Elizabeth Carter, Charlotte Lennox, Elizabeth Montagu and Fanny Burney who, although erudite and resourceful, also relied on and accepted the support of their patron, Samuel Johnson. See Norma Clarke, \textit{Dr Johnson’s Women} (London: Pimlico, 2000), 67-126.
\textsuperscript{113} Barber, \textit{Poems}, xvii.
benefit, resulted in her acquaintance with a later patron, Lord Orrery, to whom she would eventually dedicate her *Poems* (see Chapter 4). In this instance, Barber demonstrates how engaging with specific women’s plights can also be a means of engaging several potential patrons. Barber’s strategy was known to Swift who, in a letter to Orrery (which Barber used to preface her *Poems*), observed how Barber ‘never writes on a Subject with general unconnected Topicks, but always with a Scheme and Method driving to some particular End; wherein many Writers in Verse, and of some Distinction, are so often known to fail.’

It would seem that Swift was in some measure approving of Barber’s ability to avail herself of the opportunities which poetry afforded her. Barber had used the ‘Widow Gordon’ petition as an experiment to develop and trial her strategy to obtain patronage for herself, and in being successful shows how she evolved her poetic methods.

Her decision to write anonymously as the ‘Widow Gordon’ was part of this calculated strategy. Moreover, she had a model within the Dublin literary circle. It was typical of Swift either to mock his authority and originality as a writer or deliberately disguise his authorship. In the case of his poetry, we find a ‘bewildering display of mystifying devices – piracy, pseudo-piracy, clandestine issues, anonymous and pseudonymous works, misattributions and misreading.’ While these devices could weaken the reader’s confidence in Swift’s authority, that authority shifts from person to works. In *The History of the Four Last Years of the Queen* (1713; 1758), Swift notes that, while poets and writers ‘who are Dull or Superficial, void of all Taste and Judgement’ have no reservations whatsoever about sending their names into the world, writers of innovative genius often choose to remain anonymous. Anonymous masking also creates a different kind of authority through the
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freedom to critique or satirise. Samuel Johnson defines literary anonymity as a ‘mask’ that ‘confers a right of acting and speaking with less restraint, even when the wearer happens to be known’.  

In Barber’s petition, the adoption of the widow as a poetic mask created a space which allowed her to critique the patronage system and, at the same time, distance herself from those criticisms. In this case, Barber reveals that women — specifically women in a privileged position to afford patronage — have neglected their social duties in their failure to assist the widow and her family. Barber refers to these women as ‘Daughters, who at Ease recline’ who are ignorant of the Widow’s misfortunes and ‘feel no Wants, [themselves] oppress’d by none’. Barber highlights how these women were able to help, but were often unwilling to do so, choosing instead to succumb to inertia brought about by sluggish self-interest. In this sense, they typify the leisured woman of the Augustan period, living what Amanda Vickery has described as a ‘sheltered life drained of economic purpose and public responsibility’. Writing as ‘Widow Gordon’, Barber was free to represent these indifferent female aristocrats through Christian scriptural references and legal phraseology. Instead of supporting the widow in her difficulty, aristocratic women avoid her like a plague: ‘All fly th’Infection of the Widow’s Tears’; ‘Ev’n those, whose Pity eas’d my Wants with Bread, / Are now, O sad Reverse! my greatest Dread’. This image of women flying from the afflicted widow echoes the book of Psalms. The final, italicised line of the poem — ‘And Horrors have encompassed me around’ — is taken from Psalm 55:5: ‘Fearfulness and trembling are come upon me, and horror hath overwhelmed me’. It serves to amplify the

118 Barber, *Poems*, 3.
120 Barber, *Poems*, 3.
scene of despair and terror. Barber also employs biblical analogy in the stanza to Grace Carteret. There, Barber exhorts the young girl to run to her mother and ‘Plead thou the Fatherless, and Widow’s Cause’ — a command found both in Deuteronomy 10:18 and Isaiah 1:17. Through selective use of the Bible, Barber gains authority for her attack on women who were, in her eyes, guilty of both impiety and injustice. They are served the ultimate threat of retribution in the afterlife:

But know, that dreadful Hour is drawing near,
When you ’ll be treated, as you’ve acted here:
To you no more the Wretched shall complain,
’Twill be your Turn to weep, and sue in vain.

Barber preserves the formalities of the petition by working into it legal references to secular and temporal judgement. Both ‘Tribunal’ and ‘Bar’ allude simultaneously to the locations of court business and heavenly judgement. Spencer asserts that ‘the transition from maternal duty within the family to a nurturing role in a wider society was to authorise women’s writing and women’s public activity generally.’ This allows Barber to create an emotionally charged plea that appealed to both an earthly and a heavenly court, thus maximising the widow’s position and exploiting external authority for her writing.

Barber’s indirect method of approaching Lady Carteret (sending the poems anonymously via Tickell) reinforces the poet’s deliberate strategy. Addressing Carteret’s chief secretary was not an ‘indirect’ method, as Fanning suggests, but the proper protocol for submission of a petition. Barber’s decision to write the poem anonymously did not obscure her poetic voice but preserved the formalities of approaching the viceroy’s chief-secretary.

122 Deuteronomy 10:18: ‘He doth execute the judgement of the fatherless and widow, and loveth the stranger, in giving him food and raiment.’ Isaiah 1:17: ‘seek judgement, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow’. The Bible, 230-1; 766.
123 Barber, Poems, 4.
Anonymity eliminated any potential gender bias on Tickell’s part and left Barber free to voice her personal frustrations at her apparent lack of influence. This way, Barber could cleverly inspire Tickell in his duty as chief secretary to recommend the petition. A poet before he became a government official, he was particularly interested in didactic poetry. Furthermore, the dependency inherent in the patronage relationship would likely have resonated with Tickell, who was himself dependent on the Carterets for his place at Dublin Castle. As chief secretary to Carteret, Tickell would undoubtedly have dealt with scores of dedications, petitions, legal documents and letters. Addressing a poem to him not only served to personalise the exchange, but also reminded him of the crucial role he played in having it presented to the addressees. In a practical sense, her indirect approach to Tickell would later generate two subscriptions: both Thomas Tickell and his wife procured a copy of Barber’s Poems. Just as importantly, this poetic petition proved a successful exercise in self-promotion and in endorsing her strategy. Barber would later use this method in approaching her subscribers in Tunbridge Wells and Bath (see Chapter 4).

To conclude, this chapter has shown how Barber used her poetic debut to develop authority for her public female voice. Both poems remind patrons of their moral obligation to society and art. More specifically, both poems establish poetry’s particular function in transferring everlasting and mutual fame to both patron and poet. Barber’s response to Delany’s translation of The Birth of Manly Virtue, from Callimachus demonstrates the philosophical purpose of verse in its ability to present accurate likenesses and universal truths. In The Widow Gordon’s Petition Barber demonstrates how poetry served both a
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126 Tickell’s first publication, a long topographical poem, Oxford (1706), was followed by a contribution of eight short amatory poems to Tonson’s Poetical Miscellanies (1709). In a lecture ‘De poesi didactica’ given at Queen’s College, Oxford in 1711, Tickell expressed the hope that the poets of Britain would prepare themselves for the grandeur of writing didactic poetry – a talk that would have resonated with Barber, whose collection of poems is largely educational and moralistic. The lecture was given in place of Joseph Trapp – an English clergyman, academic, poet and pamphleteer who was appointed the first Oxford Professor of Poetry in 1708. Tickell also published three short poems: his popular ballad Lucy and Colin (1725), The Horn-Book (1726), and lines celebrating the classical rebuilding of medieval Queen’s College, Oxford (to which Tickell had contributed £50). See Sambrook, ‘Tickell, Thomas (1685–1740)’, ODNB.
Barber derived authority from this ‘nurturing role’ and at the same time demonstrated that writing had a practical function to which women could also contribute. Moreover, these poems demonstrate how women writers, like Barber, could navigate the patronage system. Far from playing a deferential or muted role, Barber used the medium of verse to transcend the domestic sphere and engage her patrons publicly. These poems facilitated the engagement of several persons simultaneously: Lord and Lady Carteret, their daughter Grace, their chief secretary Thomas Tickell, and the literary sphere of Delany and Swift in Dublin. When the Carterets left Dublin in 1730, Barber had already taken her place as ‘Chief Poetess’ in a circle of male and female writers and patrons who would shape and share her writing, and, more importantly, form the basis of a collective patronage from which Barber would eventually solicit subscriptions for her collection of Poems.
Chapter 2: Peers: Mutual support and reciprocal benefit in the literary friendship between Mary Barber and Constantia Grierson

In his discussion of literary patronage, John Brewer has observed how, in eighteenth-century literary circles:

Authors were not only producers of literature, but were also among its most important patrons. While some authors did not always conform to the traditional patronage criteria of being titled and wealthy, they were often able to offer other advantages which were just as important: their authority as arbiters of public taste; their credibility as established judges of literary merit; and their own valuable social influence and connections.

This chapter takes Brewer’s idea of ‘authors as patrons’ and shows how it applies to the literary friendship between Barber and Constantia Grierson. Constantia Grierson (c.1704–1732) was a classical scholar, poet, and corrector of the press, who was also included by Delany and Swift in their Senatus Consultum. She played a significant and supportive role in Barber’s creative process. Her reputation as a pious and dedicated scholar in Dublin, coupled with her involvement in the city’s printing and literary circles, was a source of inspiration and a critical asset to Barber during the construction of her volume of poetry. Both women shared, shaped and supported each other’s writing and became as influential on one another as the male patrons to whom they dedicated their works. Barber anthologised six of Grierson’s nine surviving poems posthumously in her Poems and wrote at considerable length about Grierson’s achievements in the Preface, while Grierson acted as advisor on Barber’s writing. Both women wrote verse to each other. Grierson, a faithful advocate of Barber’s literary endeavours, dedicated her longest extant poem to her. This poem publicly endorsed the poet’s subscription campaign. In another poem, she uses Barber’s son and his attempts to plagiarise his mother’s verse as a means of authenticating Barber’s writing.

Barber, for her part, included a deeply personal reflection on the death of Grierson’s son in her volume. For both women, verse proved an adaptable medium through which notions of patronage and friendship could be manoeuvred and questioned. While Barber’s verse to male patrons is generally self-conscious, mannered and sycophantic, her poetic relationship with Grierson reveals an informal, familiar and intimate exchange. This challenges the assumption made by many critics that Barber’s patronage relationships — both male and female — were superficial connections born solely out of financial obligation.

This chapter investigates the ways in which Barber and Grierson engaged in a mutually supportive relationship through verse. My investigation demonstrates how Barber used her literary relationship with Grierson as a testing-ground for developing relationships with female patrons. This is most clearly delineated in Barber’s patronage relationship with the ‘Honourable Mrs. Percival’. Martha Percival was significant figure in polite Dublin society, whose family was closely involved in George Berkeley’s Bermuda Scheme (1724–1730). Barber and Grierson each dedicated verses on Berkeley’s project to Percival; both of these works were later printed in Barber’s Poems. Barber’s poem petitioned Percival as both patron and friend, while Grierson took the opportunity to engage Percival on the darker political aspects of Ireland’s economic situation. My analysis of these poems explores the ways in which Barber and Grierson influenced each other’s writing and ideology in order to demonstrate how the terms of patronage could be manipulated to include literary friendship between women. My analysis aims to extend our understanding of how Barber navigated patronage and print, and add to our understanding of the mechanics of patronage as it applied to women in the eighteenth century.
Grierson’s reputation in Dublin

In order to evaluate Grierson’s importance as supporter of Barber, it is useful first to establish her connections and reputation in Dublin. Born Constantia Crawley, about 1694, into an impoverished family in Kilkenny, at eighteen she moved to Dublin, where she met printer and future husband, George Grierson (c.1680–1753). Grierson helped her acquire a midwifery apprenticeship under one of Dublin’s leading obstetricians: Dr John Van Lewen, the father of Laetita Van Lewen (later Pilkington). Following her successful apprenticeship, Constantia married George Grierson in 1726.

George Grierson was a master printer and bookseller of Scottish origin; it was likely that he learned the art of printing in Edinburgh. By 1720, he had established himself as an innovator, having purchased premises in Essex Street, Dublin, and become a prominent
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3 Elias has observed that nothing is known of her training in midwifery except a footnote in a satirical poem of 1727, The Grubstreet Cavalcade, Or, the Hungry Poets Petition, which ironically calls Grierson ‘a Lady of notable Abilities, that sets up for a profound Critick on Ancient and Modern Authors, no less famous for her Poetical Productions, than for her Skill in Midwifery.’ Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington, 2: 375. Laetitia Pilkington recalls her first introduction to Constantia: ‘A young Woman of about eighteen Years of Age, was brought to my Father, by a Stationer, to be by him instructed in Midwifery.’ Elias identifies the ‘Stationer’ as George Grierson. Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington, 1: 17.

4 George and Constantia were married on 17 July 1726, two years after she had first come to Dublin. Their marriage is unrecorded for the reason that she was already expecting his first child, George Primrose. (Whitehall Gazette, 17 July 1726). The parish of St. Johns, Fishamble Street, records the baptism and burial of their children: George Primrose baptised 17 July 1727; George Abrahams, baptised 1 October 1728; two daughters were buried, in 1731 and 1733. ‘Grierson, Constantia (1704/5–1732).’

5 Griffith suggests the possibility that George came from Fala in East Lothian, fourteen miles from Edinburgh. While it is impossible to ascertain what exactly motivated George to move to Dublin above other places, we know that a contemporary friend of his, James Blow, also moved to Ireland from Scotland to set up a printing business. See Lisa-Mari Griffith, ‘Mobilising Office, Education and Gender in Eighteenth-Century Ireland: The Case of the Griersons’, Eighteenth-Century Ireland/Iris an dá chultúr 22 (2007): 64-80.
member of the Dublin guild of Cutlers, Painter Stainers and Stationers.⁶ Along with reprinting editions of Alexander Pope and two plays of Joseph Addison, Grierson published poems by Patrick Delany, John Gay, Ambrose Phillips, and Dublin poet, James Ward.⁷ Grierson printed many of Richard Blackmore’s philosophical works, as well as the Old and New Testament, the Psalms, sermons, as well as almanacs and some classical works — publications that certainly established him as a reputable figure in the trade.⁸

Norma Clarke has asserted that Grierson’s move to Dublin to study midwifery masked a greater desire to be around books. Constantia was one of a number of women whose lives were profoundly affected by — even organised around — the new opportunities of print.⁹ She involved herself in every aspect of her husband’s business, and became adept at selecting, arranging, editing, introducing, proofreading and generally monitoring books through every stage of publication. Together, the Griersons produced translations of Virgil’s

---

⁶ James W. Phillips identified that the only independent ‘contemporary print of the printing press’ used in Ireland during this time was that which appears on the title page of Grierson’s *Horace*, printed in 1721. Prior to the introduction of this new print, Dublin tradesmen almost exclusively used the Blaew type press, introduced at the end of seventeenth century. It was Grierson’s introduction of this print to Dublin (which appears on the title page of Grierson’s edition of *Horace*, 1721) that earned him a gracious reputation as ‘the introducer of that noble art [of printing] into the kingdom and what a pitch of perfection he brought.’ James W. Phillips, *Printing and Bookselling in Dublin 1670-1800: A Bibliographical Enquiry* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1998), 217. Gilbert records that Grierson bought premises in Essex Street for £553 in 1709 and established a business at the sign of the ‘Two Bibles’. In October 1704 he had been admitted to the Guild of Cutlers, Painter Stationers and Stationers or the Guild of St. John the Evangelist and was subsequently made Freeman of the city in 1709. J. T. Gilbert, *A History of the City of Dublin*, 3 vols (Dublin, 1861), 3: 155.


⁸ Twenty-two of the thirty-four works Grierson was credited with before 1720 were printed for him by a range of printers, but particularly by Elizabeth Sadlier, who printed the majority of his work in 1716, and Thomas Hume. Griffith notes that this suggests that Grierson was working on building up a reputable, yet cost-effective book-selling business before he branched out and expanded the company in later years. Griffith, ‘The Case of the Griersons’, 67.

Opera (1724), Terence’s Comediae (1727) and Tacitus’s Histories (1730). Constantia dedicated the Terence edition, in Latin, to Richard, infant son of Lord Carteret. The Tacitus included a Latin dedication to Lord Carteret. Following their publication of Terence, the Griersons jointly obtained the patent for King’s Printer in 1727, although they did not formally take up this position until July 1732, when Andrew Crooke (then King’s Printer) died. As Griffith has rightly observed, it is impossible to say whether Constantia Grierson’s dedication of Tacitus to Ireland’s viceroy, Lord Carteret, was made in order to obtain the patent or as thanks for his encouragement of the Grierson family. However, the grant of the patent seems to have derived very much from Constantia’s influence on the lord lieutenant. This patent gave the Griersons exclusive license to print, publish and import the King James Bible and Book of Common Prayer, and all official documents issued by the King and his ministers.

It is through her role in obtaining the King’s patent with her husband, and her achievement as the first woman in Britain and Ireland to be appointed to the Office of King’s Printer, that Constantia’s contribution to the printing business can be better understood. Hammond identifies Constantia as the first female King’s Printer in Ireland. In 1729, both George and Constantia jointly petitioned the Irish House of Commons for the reversion of the King’s Printer’s post: George as printer, Constantia as ‘corrector of the press’ (in current terms, a proof-reader and publisher’s editor combined). The petition says nothing of

10 According to Elias, Constantia may have been working for Grierson as early as 1721, when he began issuing his pocket-sized editions of the classics. The Grierson press produced Justin’s abridgement of Pompeius Trogus (1727), an edition of Persius with a commentary and English version by Thomas Sheridan, and an edition of Ovid’s Metamorphoses. Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington, 2: 375. Together the Griersons produced a number of popular, small-format Elzevir-style editions of the classics, known as the ‘Grierson classics’. The duodecimo series of ‘Elzevirs’ became very popular and desirable among bibliophiles. Other ‘Grierson classics’ noted by Elias include: Horace (1721), Virgil (annotated Minelius 1723/1724, and Delphine 1726 or earlier), Sallust (1727 or earlier), Justin (1727), Juvenal and Persius (1728), and Ovid (1729). Elias, ‘A Manuscript Book of Constantia Grierson’s’, 35.
12 From 1732, Grierson was involved in printing at least thirteen editions of the Book of Common Prayer, and many more editions of the Bible, and became involved in printing for the Incorporated Society for Promoting English in Protestant Schools. Griffith, ‘The Case of the Griersons’, 69.
Constantia’s obstetrical training nor her English poetry but it illuminates a central focus of her career — her work as an editor. The wording of the patent is revealing, as it formally recognised her share in their achievement:

the Petitioner George hath followed the Printing Business in this City for many Years, and the Petitioner Constantia hath, in a more particular Manner, applied herself to the Correcting of the Press which she has performed to the general Satisfaction; insomuch, that the Editions corrected by her have been approved of, not only in this Kingdom, but in Great Britain, Holland, and elsewhere, and the Art of Printing, through her Care and Assistance, has been brought to greater Perfection than has been hitherto in this Kingdom.¹⁴

George is given a modest proem to what follows for Constantia. Furthermore, it demonstrates that she had achieved recognition for her own expertise and skill beyond Dublin.

Critics have questioned Constantia’s involvement in her husband’s printing business. Baxter wonders whether her ‘function as editor may have rather been that of a modern proof-reader’; in our present-day sense of the word ‘editor’. He continues dismissively, ‘she can hardly have had any qualifications or facilities for such an exacting task. It seems that her classical texts were reprints rather than editions properly so-called and her supervision typographical rather than textual’.¹⁵ Carpenter surmises that, although Grierson was known as a classical scholar and editor, it was ‘perhaps more accurately as proof-corrector of the many fine editions of classical texts published in Dublin by her husband, the printer George Grierson’.¹⁶ There are no extant books that name Constantia as printer, unlike the fourteen books published under the name of Jane Grierson (George Grierson’s wife following Constantia’s death) between 1733 and 1772.¹⁷ However, we should not be so quick to dismiss Grierson’s engagement in printing as mere ‘proof-reading’. To achieve the legal status of the first woman in Britain and Ireland to be appointed to the office was a striking
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accomplishment — even among women who were involved in printing. McDowell has explained how, in early eighteenth-century London, the professional activity of married women as printers was always difficult to trace, for Stationer’s Company records normally appeared in the husband’s name.\textsuperscript{18}

Together the Griersons rose in social status and had continuous business. The acquisition of the patent had a further significance in that it granted the Griersons an eminent position within the Irish print trade. As Griffith has noted, the title ‘King’s Printer’ allowed the Griersons to be included in the household of the lord lieutenant, and their business was advertised as part of that household in Dublin directories.\textsuperscript{19} This was a significant move up in social terms for the Grierson family. While the office (King’s Printer) was a relatively minor one, Barnard has demonstrated how the economic boom in Dublin was accompanied by a rise in the social status of tradespeople. Most printers and publishers held a higher status than that of a butcher or blacksmith, due to the scholarly nature of the business. Books were sought-after commodities and the upper classes were as extravagant in buying books as they were in purchasing homes and clothes.\textsuperscript{20} While the family could not be described as ‘quality’ (the term applied to those who were not aristocratic but considered to be of genteel status on the basis of birth, rank, education and wealth), their professional elevation enabled them to move in better circles. As well as this eminent position within the Irish print trade, the patent ensured the continuous flow of work for the family business throughout the century. Constantia and George’s descendants carried on the printing business until about 1840.\textsuperscript{21}

Constantia celebrated her involvement in print (and the annual commemoration of

\textsuperscript{20} Toby Barnard, \textit{A New Anatomy of Ireland: The Irish Protestants, 1649-1770} (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2003), 328.
\textsuperscript{21} Their son, George Grierson, whom Constantia instructed in languages and literature (who later became King’s Printer in Dublin), inherited Constantia’s classical interests and won even wider fame. Dr. Johnson described him respectfully as a man of great learning, wit and vivacity. Griffith, ‘The Case of the Griersons’, 64. See also Baxter, ‘Latin Texts and Irish Editors’, 36.
printers) with the publication of her poem, The Art of Printing, in 1728. This poem of eighteen lines was issued by her husband George Grierson, with the heading: ‘Having been favoured with the following beautiful lines, on the art of printing; written by Mrs. C. Grierson we here present them to the public’. It was printed from a press fixed upon a carriage, and distributed during a street procession of printers, on the lord mayor’s day in Dublin. The poem is an attempt to intervene in the public sphere in order to mould opinion in relation to printing. Constantia saw verse as a means of advertising the benefits of print and reading culture. As a craft, she claims, printing facilitates personal expression: ‘Hail mystic art, which men like angels taught, / To speak, to eyes, and paint embody’d thought.’ Crucially, printed works are mobile: they can ‘travel o’er the wide extent of ALL’, giving life to ‘dead letters’. Most importantly, printed works bestow ‘immortal honour’ and ‘bid all deeds and titles last and live’.

One cannot fail to note the parallel here between Grierson’s reflections on printing and Barber’s insistence on the endurance of printed poetry in her dedication On Reading The Birth of Manly Virtue to Lord Carteret three years earlier.

Through her printing connections, Constantia penetrated the selective literary circle of Delany and Swift. As a key member of Swift’s ‘Triumfeminate’, she established herself as the group’s intellectual force, performing the roles of critic and advisor. As noted in Chapter 1, she was also responsible for introducing the Pilkingtons to Delany and Swift.

Grierson wrote some poems, and although she was notoriously circumspect in sharing these poems beyond the Delville circle, those that survive reveal a sharp and penetrating mind. Grierson was particularly frank in her poems about rebuking women for the ill use of their time and
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25 Laetitia noted in her Memoirs: ‘The Learned Nymph before-mentioned [Grierson], whom Curiosity engaged every Person to see, had shewn many of my Scribbles to Doctor Delany.’ Elias, Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington, 1: 24.
resources. ‘A Ticket to a Young Lady for the Ridotto’ [public ball], begins just as Constantia has finished dispensing some advice:

In Pleasures now you may proceed
You’re from Constantia’s harangues freed
Which when you heard you minded not
Or if you did have quite forgot.

The poem ends with the serious exhortation to give ‘your early prime / To [God] who Gave thee all thy time.’

In an undated letter, Constantia advises Frances Arabella Kelly, whose wit made her a feature of Delany’s circle:

God has bestowd on you such a fine understanding & so many other eminent advantages to be trifled away in the impertinenceys and baubles of the fashionable World that seem rather fit for the amusements of a Child than the employment of rational minds[,] make a right use Lovly nymph of the Gifts of heavn[:] they must increase either your Glory or you Misery[.] there is no medium.

In another fragmentary poem, Grierson speaks forcefully and with directness about the importance of women’s role in patronage. Addressed to an unnamed woman, the poem is a powerful call to women to support each other and liberate themselves from the tyranny of men:

To you Illustrious Fair I tune my Song
To you alone of right my lays belong
Attend and Patronise a work designd
To free you from the Oppression of mankind
And ye harmonious Nine whose heavenly Fire
Does Mortal breasts with Godlike thoughts inspire
To who are Learning Wit and Arts assignd
To show th’ extensive powrs of woman’s Mind
By your enliv’ning force assist my Lays
Who praises Women does the Muses praise.

The ‘harmonious nine’ Muses ‘whose heavenly Fire’ inspires all with ‘Godlike thought’ are female, and it is women who are the source of creativity, ‘Wit and Arts’. Thus, reading these

lines, it is easy to see how Grierson inspired women writers, like Barber, and held such significant status within the Dublin coterie.

This circle was largely responsible for spreading Constantia’s reputation as a classical scholar. In letters to Pope and Lord Bathurst, Swift observed that Grierson was ‘a very good Latin and Greek Scholar’, who ‘hath lately published a fine edition of Tacitus, with a Latin Dedication to the Lord Lieutenant.’\(^{29}\) In her *Memoirs*, Laetitia Pilkington acknowledged Grierson as ‘Mistress of Hebrew, Greek, Latin and French [who] understood the Mathematics as well as most men.’\(^{30}\) Similarly, in the Preface to her *Poems*, Barber provided a generous list of Grierson’s achievements: ‘Constantia Grierson was an excellent Scholar, not only in Greek and Roman Literature, but in History, Divinity, Philosophy and Mathematics’\(^{31}\)

Grierson’s contemporary scholarly reputation was undoubtedly impressive. Assessments of her abilities have been offered by modern critics, including Phillips, who judged that, in her nine years as editor and press corrector, her editions of Terence and Tacitus were ‘witness to her skill in the field’\(^{32}\). W.B. Stanford has drawn attention to Grierson’s achievement as the first female classical scholar in Ireland, and as such, Ireland’s rival to French scholar and translator of the classics, Anne Dacier (1654–1720).\(^{33}\) Even Baxter was forced to concede that ‘there can be no doubt that [Grierson’s] work answered a demand, and stimulated a need, for copies of the classics.’\(^{34}\) However, Elias has suggested that Grierson’s knowledge may have been overstated by friends who appeared undecided, if enthusiastic, about Grierson’s literary skills. Pilkington’s claims for Grierson must be somewhat mitigated by her own admitted ignorance of all languages except English. Elias has also highlighted the disparity in the recollections of her literary circle, noting that Mary

\(^{29}\) Swift, *Corr.*, 3: 278-9; 328.


\(^{31}\) Barber, *Poems*, xxvii.


\(^{34}\) Baxter, ‘Latin Texts and Irish Editors’, 36.
Delany believed Grierson knew Greek, but not Hebrew, and that Barber’s description of her learning omits Hebrew and French, adding History, Divinity and Philosophy. Lonsdale modifies this view, stating: ‘While it would be reasonable to question the qualifications of Pilkington and Barber as assessors in all these fields of learning, such interest in and knowledge of languages in a largely self-educated woman of humble background was clearly unusual.’ Ehrenpreis concurs, remarking that ‘Mrs Grierson had an unheard-of erudition for a citizen’s wife.’

As Lonsdale and Ehrenpreis note, Grierson’s fame as a classical scholar was unusual given her humble origins and the restrictive eighteenth-century attitude towards women’s education and learning. Some women, such as Elizabeth Carter, were highly educated, while others such as Hannah More, Elizabeth Tollet and Anna Seward became famous through their scholarly pursuits. There are several examples of women writers who had Latin and also of men who encouraged their learning of it. Johnson, when he lived with the Thrales, insisted on teaching Latin to Queeney Thrale and Frances Burney. Lady Mary Wortley Montagu sat in on her brother’s education, while Hannah More and Sarah Fielding were also solidly grounded in Latin. However, the mastery of Latin was a defining feature of the elite classes. Such an education was denied even the majority of men — Johnson remarked that ‘Classical quotation is the parole of literary men all over the world’ [my italics] — and rarely available.
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35 Elias, ‘A Manuscript of Constantia Griersons’, 36-7. See also Mary Delany to Mrs. Anne Dewes, 28 July 1750: ‘Mrs. Grierson understood Greek, but not Hebrew, I believe.’ Llanover, Autobiography and Correspondence of Mary Granville, Mrs. Delany, 2: 301.
36 Lonsdale, Eighteenth-Century Women Poets, 91.
37 Ehrenpreis, Swift, 3: 636.
to women of even the highest class.\textsuperscript{40} In his \textit{Essay upon Projects}, Daniel Defoe, responding to Mary Astell’s call for a female academy, articulated widely shared responses to the dangers of female learning:

\begin{quote}
I know 'tis dangerous to make Publick Appearances of the Sex; they are not either to be confin’d or expos’d; the first will disagree with their Inclinations, and the last with their Reputations; and therefore I doubt a Method propos’d by an Ingenious Lady, in a little Book, call’d, \textit{Advice to the Ladies}, would be found impracticable.\textsuperscript{41}
\end{quote}

Classical scholarship was, thus, unusual and problematic for women. Jane Stevenson’s study of neo-Latin women poets has demonstrated the ambivalent relationship between women and classical scholarship in the period. Latin-educated women, Stevenson writes, were by this time a relatively small section of the reading public and early modern readers increasingly demanded translations.\textsuperscript{42} Furthermore, by the eighteenth century, Latinate women had a decidedly ambiguous status. In keeping with society’s expectations, women who had Latin were not generally encouraged to display it publicly, but rather were expected to maintain a modest understanding of the classics in private. As Stevenson notes, ‘the sprezzatura of polite society was not compatible with too much booklearning; those who had it did not parade it.’\textsuperscript{43} Indeed, conservative texts of the time stressed the need to give women a limited education in keeping with their role as keepers of the domestic economy. Barber’s contemporary, Mary Masters, voiced her limitations thus when introducing her collection of poems:

\begin{quote}
The Author of the following Poems never read a treatise of Rhetorick, or an Art of Poetry, nor was ever taught her English Grammar. Her Education rose no higher than the Spelling-Book, or the Writing-Master: her Genius to Poetry was always brow-beat by and discountena’d by her Parents, and till her Merit got the better of her Fortune, she was shut out of all Commerce with the
\end{quote}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{43} Stevenson, \textit{Women Latin Poets}, 389.
\end{flushright}
more knowing and polite Part of the World.\textsuperscript{44}

One of the ways in which classics could be portrayed as moral was by narrowing the interpretation of classical texts and turning the emphasis upon Christian piety and charity. One way in which the sphere of learning could be negotiated was to distinguish exemplary female authors from those who failed to combine wit and virtue. In her \textit{Memoirs}, Pilkington attempts to explicate Grierson’s erudition by weaving an imaginative thread between her knowledge of languages and the gift of tongues on the day of Pentecost. But she is careful to bring her down to earth by picturing a homelier Grierson at needlework:

\begin{quote}
And what made these extraordinary Talents yet more surprising was, that her Parents were poor illiterate Country People; so that her Learning appeared like the Gift poured on on the Apostles, of speaking all Languages, without the Pains of Study; or, like the intuitive Knowledge of the Angels: Yet inasmuch as the Power of Miracles is ceased; we must allow she used human Means for such great and excellent Acquirements: And yet in a long Friendship and Familiarity with her, I could never obtain a satisfactory Account from her on this Head; only she said, she had received some little Instruction from the Minister of the Parish, when she could spare Time from her Needle-work, to which she was closely kept by her Mother.\textsuperscript{45}
\end{quote}

For the contemporary audience, Grierson’s reserve in advertising her erudition was significant. Learned women, like Grierson, found themselves in the paradoxical situation of not having to become public examples by not exposing themselves, by not pushing themselves too much into the public eye. That she grasped some knowledge from the parish minister in between household tasks was in keeping with notions of women’s modesty and propriety.

\textit{Barber as Grierson’s literary executor}

Barber played a crucial role in establishing Grierson’s posthumous literary reputation. In the Preface to her \textit{Poems}, printed three years after Constantia’s death, she memorialised

\textsuperscript{44} Mary Masters, \textit{Poems on Several Occasions} (London, 1733), 1.

and celebrated Grierson’s achievements over two pages. These included a short biographical sketch of her character and summary of her achievements. Barber pointed to Grierson’s cerebral ingenuity, but was careful to couple it with an understanding that she worked hard to acquire her intellect: ‘What makes her Character the more remarkable, is, that she rose to this Eminence in Learning merely by the Force of her own Genius, and continual Application.’ Barber also marries learning and virtue in her description of Grierson’s talents, specifying both the scholarly and saintly qualities of Grierson’s character:

She was not only happy in a fine Imagination, a great Memory, an excellent Understanding, and an exact Judgement, but had all these crown’d by Virtue and Piety; she was too learned to be vain, too wise to be conceited, too knowing and too clear-sighted to be irreligious.  

Barber enlarges upon this claim, that had Grierson lived, she would have proven herself a formidable figure in the learned world:

If Heaven had spared her Life, and blessed her with Health which She wanted for some Years before her Death, there is good Reason to think, She would have made as great a Figure in the learned World, as any of her Sex are recorded to have done.  

Barber is careful here not to overstep the boundaries of propriety. Her claim only reaches as far as ‘any of her Sex are recorded to have done’. Furthermore, Grierson’s literary agency stems from her ambition to use these qualities for the good of others. It is this modesty, Barber claims, that is the mark of Grierson’s genius: ‘As her Learning and Abilities raised her above her own Sex, so they left her no Room to envy any; On the contrary, her Delight was to see Others excel’. Barber’s eulogy had the effect of creating the image of an extraordinary figure whose exceptional self-education, coupled with a lack of pretension, set her apart from her female counterparts. Little wonder then, as Pilkington noted, that

46 Barber, Poems, xxviii.
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48 Barber, Poems, xxviii, xxix.
Grierson’s literary exploits ‘engag’d everyone with a Curiosity to see her.’

By crediting Grierson with virtues fashionable to an eighteenth-century audience, Barber incurred a reciprocal benefit by association. One example is Barber’s discussion of Lord Carteret and Grierson’s patronage relationship: according to Barber, Carteret was always searching for literary talent and, as a ‘truly worthy Nobleman so eminent for Learning and great Abilities’, he would ‘distinguish those Excellencies wheresoever He found them’. Carteret was so impressed by Constantia Grierson’s ‘Excellencies’ that in naming her husband, George Grierson, King’s Printer, he further added Constantia’s name in the patent issued in Dublin, along with that of her husband. In her Preface, Barber claimed how it was to Carteret’s credit that he distinguished the Griersons:

nor can I omit mentioning what I think is greatly to the Lord Carteret’s Honour, that when he was Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, He obtained a Patent for Mr. Grierson her Husband to be the King’s Printer, and to distinguish and reward her uncommon Merit had her Life inserted in it.

Barber’s reference to the inclusion of Constantia’s ‘Life’ (biography) in the deed acknowledges Constantia’s integral contribution to the securing of the contract and reveals just how closely Constantia was identified with business of printing. Of course, it also enabled Barber to applaud Carteret’s patronage and thus incur the reciprocal benefit of being connected to the ‘excellent’ Grierson and Ireland’s viceroy.

As demonstrated in Chapter 1, Barber was able to manipulate patronage opportunities to her own advantage. Her friendship with Grierson also proved beneficial. Barber could advertise, and at the same time appropriate, Grierson’s celebrity to give credibility to her own work. By association, Grierson’s qualities become part of Barber’s character, to the extent that both poets’ virtues inflect and reflect one another. Furthermore, Grierson’s early death

---

50 Barber, Poems, xx.
51 Barber, Poems, xx.
ensured that her reputation remained unblemished. Only posthumous fame could avoid the risk of self-corruption. At a time when modesty was paramount to the reception of women writers’ works, Barber carefully cemented Grierson’s unimpeachable public profile within her preface.

Barber’s preface became the source for information about Grierson, reproduced in periodicals and contemporaneous literary biographies that became popular during the period. Her account was printed in the September issue of the *Gentleman’s Magazine* (1735) with the preamble:

Many of our Readers being very inquisitive concerning the ingenious Ladies who do Honour to this Magazine by their poetical Performances, we hope some Time or other to be enabled to satisfy their Curiosity; mean while we shall oblige them with Mrs Grierson’s Character, as we find it in Mrs. Barber’s Preface to her Poems.52

The 1750s saw a surge of publications describing the lives of female authors, celebrating their achievements and recirculating their work. The first of these, by George Ballard, *Memoirs of Several Ladies of Great Britain, Who have been Celebrated for their Writings, or Skill in the Learned Languages, Arts and Sciences* (1752), borrows indiscriminately from Barber’s Preface. It begins in the fourteenth century with ‘Juiliana, or the Princess of Poland, a Tragicomedy’ and ends with Constantia Grierson’s death in 1732.53 Shiells and Cibber’s *The Lives of the Poets of Great Britain and Ireland, to the time of Dean Swift* (1753) also uses Barber’s preface as a source. There are twelve female poets included, beginning with Katherine Philips (1631–64) and ending with Laetitia Pilkington (1712–50).54 Coleman and Thornton, in *Poems by Eminent Ladies* (1755), also borrowed from Barber’s preface and noted that Grierson’s poems are ‘dispersed up and down Mrs. Barber’s volume of poems’.55

52 *The Gentleman’s Magazine*, 5 (September 1735), 550.
53 George Ballard, *Memoirs of Several Ladies of Great Britain, Who have been Celebrated for their Writings, or Skill in the Learned Languages and Sciences* (Oxford, 1752), 16, 475.
Both poets were reproduced together in these verse anthologies. Somerset poet Mary Scott (1751–1793) also borrowed from Barber and Ballard for the notes to her poem, *The Female Advocate* (1774). Scott looked to Grierson as a model and emphasised her humble origins. Grierson, who ‘Sprung from a race, illiterate, rude and poor’, was obliged to submit to the drudgery of the needle:

To all th’ emoluments of Art unknown,  
Yet Wit and Learning mark’d her for their own.  
With wond’rous ease, her comprehensive mind  
The various shores of knowledge all combin’d:  
A mind by nature form’d with strictest care  
To teach us what superior beings are.  

Barber’s encomium of Grierson was not confined to her preface; she also anthologised her poetry in her own Poems. Grierson’s poetry survives because it was included in Barber’s collection and was subsequently anthologised in later collections of women’s verse. During her lifetime, Grierson’s energies were concentrated on classical translation and she appears to have suffered some anxiety about the quality of her poems. Most of her verse was short, and her modesty ensured it appeared anonymously. In her Preface, Barber noted that Grierson ‘wrote several fine Poems in English, on which she set so little Value, that she neglected to leave Copies behind her but of very few.’ Elias has noted that only one poem, *The Goddess Envy to Doctor Delany* (1730), which is undoubtedly Constantia’s, appeared in print during her lifetime. Laetitia Pilkington’s claim is incorrect that ‘none of [Grierson’s] various and beautiful Writings, except one Poem of her’s in Mrs.

---

58 Barber, *Poems*, xvii.  
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Barber’s Works’, was published (and largely a covert swipe at Barber). Of her nine published poems, six survive in Barber’s Poems and three more (one of them fragmentary) in Laetitia Pilkington’s Memoirs. In 1987, Elias discovered a manuscript of her poems which adds a further thirteen poems and verse fragments and three prose pieces to the tally.

By actively controlling the dissemination of Grierson’s verse, Barber claims the role of Grierson’s literary executor. She took her role seriously. She states that the poems that were left were specifically entrusted to her, to be published with her collection after Grierson’s death:

Those Poems should never have appeared in this Collection, but that from her abundant Regard to me, she made me promise, a little before her Death, to publish them upon that Occasion.

Barber’s suggestion here is obvious: Grierson’s poems would have been lost except for Barber’s careful anthologising of her verse. Anthologising Grierson’s verse enabled Barber to act as a patron herself. Barber was aware of the reciprocal benefit in publishing poems by other hands. She stated in her Preface: ‘whether my own Verses shall be approv’d of by my Subscribers or not, it is a Pleasure to me to think that those written by other Hands will always make this Collection of Value.’ The poems Barber included in her collection, which also contains two verses by English poet and devotional writer, Elizabeth Singer Rowe (1674–1737) and William Ward, demonstrates how carefully Barber constructed her collection (see Chapter 4 for a discussion of Rowe and Ward). Including poems by other recognised women writers offered a valuable opportunity for self-promotion: it was a way to
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add value to Barber’s own collection of verse.

One of Grierson’s poems which Barber chose to anthologise neatly endorsed Barber’s poetry. Grierson’s ardent commendatory verse, ‘To Mrs. Mary Barber, under the Name of Sapphira: occasion’d by the Encouragement she met with in England, to publish her Poems by Subscription’ was placed by Barber at the head of the volume. It is, essentially, a ‘review’ of Barber’s poetry, advertising her poetic skill. Here Grierson acts as a literary arbiter who defends Barber from charges of sycophancy and hack-writing. According to Grierson, Barber’s verse is a fresh alternative to worn-out cliché: ‘Far different Themes We in thy Verses view; / Themes in themselves, alike sublime and new.’ Grierson further asserts, that stylistically, Barber’s panegyric is well-formed: ‘So Elegant, and so Refin’d thy Praise, / As greatest Minds, at once, might mend and please.’ She celebrates the originality and significance of ‘foremothers’ and sisters as women’s distinctive contributions to literature. In place of traditional motifs — ‘Long has the Warrior’s, and the Lover’s Fire, / Employ’d the Poet, and ingross’d the Lyre’ — Barber’s verse demonstrates a new trend towards social conscience: ‘To ease those Wants with which the Wretched pine, / And imitate Beneficence divine.’ Poetry is presented as enhancing the public good rather than serving the poet’s self-interest. According to Grierson, Barber is not a mere stylist; she is also a satirist with a reforming conscience: ‘When, more gay, her spritely Satire bites / ’Tis not to wound, but to instruct, She writes.’ Unlike the ‘Triflers’ who have written ‘Guiltless of Sense, or Elegance or Wit’, Barber’s ‘wise Reflections’ are instructive. Elias believes that, although the Grierson poems ‘serve as a tribute of true sincerity from a tragic figure, the intermingling of Grierson’s poems does Mrs. Barber too much credit’. In her Preface, Barber anticipates the judgement of such readers and attempts to excuse any potential hint at bias on Grierson’s behalf by pointing to their friendship:

65 Barber, Poems, xlv, xlvi.
The poems written in my Favour by Mrs Grierson, will, I think, be allow’d to do Honour to the Female Sex in general, and they are a strong Proof that Women may have so much Virtue, as, instead of depreciating, to endeavour to raise the Character of each other. To her known Friendship for me, the Reader must attribute the great Partiality she has there shewn; nothing else could have bias’d her Judgement.67

This enables Barber to suggest that friendship was the motivation for Grierson’s encouragement. Barber is demonstrating the powerful role women play in supporting and vindicating each other’s work. With Grierson’s reputation secured, Barber is able to control and freely promote their friendship — as opposed to Laetitia Pilkington who later had a very different, scandalous reputation. Highlighting her association with Grierson was an opportunity to self-promote on a public level.

Grierson and Barber also engaged on a personal, intimate level. The most eloquent testimony to the importance of friendship between Barber and Grierson is documented in their verses to their sons. Two of Barber’s poems, in particular, — ‘Occasion’d by seeing some Verses written by Mrs. Constantia Grierson, upon the Death of her Son’ and ‘Upon my Son’s speaking Latin in School to less Advantage than English: Written as from a Schoolfellow’— indicate the existence of a multi-layered, close personal engagement between the two poets. These poems show how Barber and Grierson turned to each other for understanding, consolation and shared expressions of experience. Simultaneously, they reveal how both poets directly assisted each other in the writing process, at times even assimilating and appropriating each other’s voice.

The intimacy between Barber and Grierson is particularly evident in their poetic exchange on the death of Grierson’s son. Constantia gave birth to her first child, baptised George Primrose Grierson, in 1727, the same year she published her edition of Terence. A

67 Barber, Poems, xxvi-xxvii.
few months later, the boy died, accidentally smothered by a nurse.⁶⁸ Constantia memorialised this ‘Unhappy Child to early Sorrows born’ in a touching poem which was circulated among the Dublin set: ‘Ah Lovely harmless Shade Couds [sic] thou but see / How much thy wretched mother mourns for thee.’⁶⁹ Barber responded, commemorating the tragedy in lines which registered Grierson’s grief: ‘See how she mourns her Son’s untimely Doom, / And pours her Woe’s o’er the relentless Tomb.’⁷⁰

Patricia Phillippy has documented how, in the early modern period, the potential death of a baby or mother during childbirth was ‘a pervasive and painful fact of life for most women’.⁷¹ Though notoriously difficult to quantify precisely, maternal and infant mortality rates were high in the early eighteenth century; Roy Porter estimates that ‘a fifth of all babies died in their first year; perhaps one in three died ... before the age of five.’⁷² Elias rather callously suggests that, as infant mortality was a fact of life, it ‘should not have bothered sensible parents unduly’.⁷³ However, both Grierson and Barber’s poems on this tragic moment give the lie to the assumption that eighteenth-century parents felt the death of children less keenly than modern parents. Barber’s long, narrative poem, written in heroic couplets — contrasting with the tetrameter she usually employed — emphasises the poem’s gravity. Barber responds to Grierson’s learning and philosophical leaning by employing logic to interpret the sad event. She couples this with Christian faith in order to reconcile Grierson to her son’s death. In the poem’s first section, Barber depicts Grierson as a ‘Mourning Mother’ who has become disillusioned with philosophy following her son’s death. Grierson’s
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knowledge of the classics was wide-ranging; she ‘can with Ease explore / The arts of Latium, and the Grecian Store’, and was ‘early learn’d, nay more, was early wise’. Her understanding of the human condition means that Grierson was enlightened enough to eschew the ‘Pride of Science’ and its attempts to explain away the human condition.

The irony, according to Barber, is that philosophy cannot solve the mystery of death, nor can it alter the true course of human life. Similarly, George’s death can neither be explained nor rationalised through abstract argument alone. Thus, the consolation of philosophy is no longer available to Grierson following the death of her son:

Yet ah! How vain to guard the Soul, we see,  
Are the best precepts of Philosophy!  
See Nature triumph o’er the boasted Art,  
Ev’n in a Solon’s and Constantia’s Heart.

Barber’s reference to sixth-century BC Athenian poet, politician and lawmaker, Solon, draws on Plutarch’s *Life of Solon*, which Barber pointed to in a footnote to the 1734 edition of her *Poems*. An edition of Plutarch’s *Lives* by French Hellenist Anne Dacier was published in London in 1727 — the same year Constantia’s son died, and was possibly the edition that Grierson and Barber read. Plutarch’s *Life of Solon* narrates Solon’s return from exile to Athens, upon which he learns of his son’s death. In Athens, Solon meets a stranger, who, at the request of the eminent philosopher, Thales, engages Solon with an account of a young man’s funeral. This eventually leads to Solon’s tragic discovery that it was his own son who had died in his absence:
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Thus Solon was drawn on by every Answer, and his Fears heightened, till at last, being extremely concern’d, he mention’d his own Name, and ask’d the Stranger if that young Man was not call’d Solon’s Son; and the Stranger assenting, he began to beat his Head, and to do and say such things as Men usually do in so great a Passion.

At this point in the narrative, Thales tells Solon ‘not to be concern’d at this Report, for ’tis all Fiction’. Thales had deliberately constructed the story as a means of teaching Solon that no one is exempt from suffering and death; both wise and good persons suffer. According to Thales, ‘no one is free from Solicitude’, and ‘we must not provide against the loss of Wealth, by Poverty; or the loss of Friends, by refusing all Acquaintance; or the death of Children by getting none; but by a proper use of Reason against all such Accidents.’

Thales’s argument forms the basis of Barber’s poem to Grierson. Barber compares of Solon’s fictional encounter with his son’s death to Grierson’s real-life confrontation with tragedy in order to offer consolation to her friend. Far from negating Grierson’s love for her child, Barber’s careful selection of this classical analogy demonstrates a deep understanding of Grierson’s education, values and patterns of thought. Moreover, Barber uses this to encourage Grierson to have a rational opinion of death. In the latter half of the poem, Barber plays Thales to Grierson’s Solon, creating a fictionalised account of George’s life (had he lived) in order to interpret, and bring Grierson to an acceptance of, George’s death. Barber juxtaposes the philosophical argument of the first section with a Christian vision of afterlife. Anticipating Elizabeth Singer Rowe’s prose fiction *Letters from the Dead to the Living* (1728), in which children compare heaven with their time on earth, Barber imagines the visit of the boy’s guardian angel, as he comforts Grierson with visions of her ‘lovely Boy’ in heaven:

```
Oft let the Guardian Angel of her Son
Tell her in faithful Dreams, his Task is done;
Shew, how he kindly led her lovely Boy
To Realms of Peace, and never-fading Joy.  
```

---

The masculine end-rhymes of ‘Son’ and ‘done’, ‘Boy’ and ‘Joy’, serve here to evoke simplicity and finality. She avoids the bombast, inflation and pretentiousness of a failed attempt at profundity. Her verse calls for an acceptance of the ordinariness of death.

In the final section of Barber’s poem, she presents Grierson with a Christian argument in order to jolt her out of despair. In a fictionalised account of the life that might have awaited George, she urges ‘Heaven’ to show Constantia images of her son, if his fate was reversed and he had lived:

Shew the false World, seducing him from Truth;
And paint the slipp’ry, dang’rous Paths of Youth:
Shew him in riper Years, beset with Snares,
Wearied with struggling tho’ unnumbered Cares.
Convey him thence to Life’s remotest Stage,
To fell the dire Calamities of Age;
Opprest with Sorrow, with Distempers torn,
Or rack’s with Guilt, much harder to be born:
Raise the Distress, and let her darling Care,
Distracted in the Horrors of Despair,
The dreadful Scene of Judgement op’ning see,
And, trembling, plunge into Eternity. 81

Far from negating the real sympathy she clearly felt for her friend, this gives her the opportunity to engage Grierson in a debate about death. Through death, Barber argues, Grierson’s son has been saved, not only from physical pain, but from the sins which he was destined to indulge in and trouble he might have undergone through life. By cutting his life so short, George is guaranteed eternal grace. In Grierson’s mind, too, he will live on unsullied by sin. Barber is determined to demonstrate that knowledge cannot soothe something as utterly unreasonable or incomprehensible as death. Philosophy should lead its readers to Christ and not to pagan stoicism.

That Barber was able to write so candidly about Grierson’s grief underlines the intellectual and emotional connection she had with her. Her extremes of vision reflect the

81 Barber, Poems, 39-40.
emotional despair and imbalance that result from an encounter with premature death and the desperate need for those living to find a solution to their grief. There is a sense that both women were used to debating and reasoning with each other, exchanging different points of view, and were unafraid to challenge each other in person, or in verse. Thus, the poem is an example of the intellectual, emotional and spiritual support between the two women.

In a similar way, Grierson’s ‘Upon my Son speaking Latin to less Advantage than English: Written as from a Schoolfellow’, ventriloquises Barber’s voice and directly responds to two earlier poems by Barber: ‘To Mr. Rose; sent in the Name of the Honourable Mr. Barry, one of his Schoolfellows: Written by the Reverend Dr. T—’, and ‘Written for my Son, to Mr. Barry occasion’d by the foregoing Verses’. In both of these poems, Barber exposes her son Con’s plagiarism of her verse. On one level, the poems are a didactic exposé of Con’s fraudulent claims to his mother’s verse; on a more subtle level, these poems are concerned with defending Barber’s writing. We are not told who ‘Mr. Barry’ is, or the ‘Reverend Mr. T’.

Similarly, we cannot be sure if Con wrote the offending verse. Ultimately, the historical accuracy of the poem is irrelevant: it is not important whether Con actually wrote these poems and presented them in school. What is significant is that Barber’s use of ‘poetic masking’ allowed her to assert her maternal authority, using Con as the means by which she engages the public sphere. Barber uses classical mythology to establish her literary authority. She adopts the Greek god Phoebus (Apollo), who entrusts his chariot (the gift of poetry) to her but not to her son:

PRESUMPTUOUS Youth! This dang’rous Art forbear;
Nor tempt a Character beyond thy Sphere.
Let meaner Flames thy tender Breast inspire;
Touch not a Beam of hers – ’Tis sacred Fire!
Phoebus might trust thy Mother with his Son;
But you, fond Boy, may prove a Phaethon.

All three poems are reproduced in Barber’s Poems, 83; 85-6; 87.
Mr. Clement Barry appears on Barber’s subscription list, as does Rev. Mr. John Travers, and Rev. Mr. Thompson of Athy. See ‘Subscription List for Mary Barber, Poems’, Appendix 2.
Barber, Poems, 84.
According to myth, Phaeton, son of Phoebus, approaches his father to ask permission to drive his chariot — the sun — for a day. Phoebus tries to dissuade him by telling him that not even Zeus would dare to drive it, as the chariot was hot and its dragon-like horses exhaled flames. Phaeton, however, is adamant and Phoebus finally relents. When the day comes, Phoebus anoints Phaeton’s hand with magic oil to keep the chariot from burning him. Nonetheless, Phaeton is unable to control the fierce horses, as they sense a weaker hand at the reins. Eventually, Zeus is forced to intervene by striking the runaway chariot with a lightning bolt to halt it, and Phaeton plunges into the river to his death. The message here is that Barber, unlike her son, or Phaeton, can be trusted with poetry. If Apollo held the chariot, it was Barber who could hold the reins. Barber’s voice is assured and her imaginative self-realization contrasts with the image of a rhetorically modest female poet, reiterating claims of diffidence.

Significantly, Apollo often appears when Barber desires to assert herself as a poet. In ‘Apollo’s Edict’, also published in Barber’s Poems, she creates an anti-canonical by collecting and criticising the poetic clichés and conventions of her time.85 The poem considers the serious purposes of poetry and (albeit ironically) forbids the use of hackneyed phrases: ‘Let beaten Paths no more be trac’d; / But study to correct your Taste.’86 Apollo appears again in ‘Written for my Son, to Mr. Barry’. This time, Con answers his mother by stating that, if Phoebus had made her verses divine, then he, as her son, should be able to write well:

Since Phoebus made your Verse divine,  
Since God glows in ev’ry Line;  
Why should you think, but I, with Ease,  
Might write my native, artless Lays?87

Grierson adopts Barber’s method and also makes use of a poetic veil, assimilating

85 For a full discussion of the authorship of this poem, see Oliver J. Ferguson, ‘The Authorship of ‘Apollo’s Edict’’, PMLA 70 (June 1955): 433-40.  
86 Barber, Poems, 105.  
87 Barber, Poems, 85.
Barber’s voice in order to engage both Barber and her son, Con. The poem, although clearly attributed: ‘By Mrs. Grierson’ in Barber’s Poems, is written from the point of view of Con’s schoolfriend. Grierson’s decision to include the possessive phrase ‘Upon my Son’, however, indicates that she is also appropriating Barber’s voice in the poem. Grierson makes use of the same Greek mythology as Barber. Grierson validates Barber’s writing by creating an ‘Olympian’ past to support and contextualise Barber’s experience as a writer. In Grierson’s mythic account, she explains that Phoebus (Apollo) grew jealous of the ‘double Portion of celestial Fire’ bestowed on Barber by the Muses:

But, when he saw each Muse, with endless Pains,  
Forming the curious Texture of her Brains;  
When he beheld them anxious to inspire  
A double Portion of celestial Fire;  
Grown jealous for the Honour of the Dead,  
He thus, in Anger, to the Virgins said:  
‘In vain you strive, with such unwearied Care,  
‘To grace the Breast of this accomplish’d Fair.’

There are verbal echoes between Grierson’s ‘double Portion of celestial Fire’ and the ‘sacred Fire’ in Barber’s earlier poem. Grierson suggests that Phoebus’ fury results from Barber’s potential triumph through her verse. In Grierson’s poem, Barber rivals the Olympian god himself. The mythology Grierson creates for Barber attempts to pose a threat to the existing literary and mythological order. A similar idea formed the theme of Swift’s mock-pastoral ‘Apollo Outwitted’ (1711), which he dedicated to his friend the poet, Anne Finch, Countess of Winchelsea (1661–1720). In Swift’s poem, Apollo is outraged when he realises that he has been deceived by ‘Ardelia’ (Finch) and cannot revoke his gift to her of the assistance of the nine muses. Out of jealousy, Apollo curses her with stubborn pride and denies her poetic

---

88 Barber, Poems, 88-9.  
89 In the seventeenth century, ‘To the excellent Orinda’ (1663), dedicated to poet and playwright, Katherine Philips (1632-1664), offered a radical re-thinking of the woman poet. The poem praised Philips as the female substitute of Apollo: ‘Let the male Poets, their male Phoebus chuse, / Thee I invoke, Orinda, for my Muse.’ ‘To the Excellent Orinda’, Early Modern Women Poets: An Anthology, ed. Jane Stevenson and Peter Davidson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 402-406.
fame. ‘Ardelia’ is destined to be a minor poet, whose lines will never be heard. Apollo’s final vengeful curse is that Ardelia may win fame, only by yielding to the plea of one whose political leanings she despises:

And last my Vengeance to Compleat,  
May you descend to take Renown,  
Prevail’d on by the Thing you hate,  
A Whig, and one that wears a Gown.⁹⁰

In Grierson’s poem to Barber, this threat is finally resolved when Phoebus equips Barber with a tragic flaw: he withholds Latin — the ‘universal Tongue’ — from the aspiring poet:

‘In vain you labour to adorn her Mind  
‘With tuneful Numbers, and with Sense refin’d  
‘With ev’ry Elegance of Thought and Phrase;  
‘With Virgil’s Purity, and Ovid’s Ease;  
‘Tho’ she with them in all their Graces vie;  
‘Yet I’ll their universal Tongue deny.’¹⁰

Phoebus is presented here as the archetypal patriarchal figure, who has refused Barber her classical education. Like many eighteenth-century women of her class, Barber was excluded a classical education; however, she did not possess Grierson’s talents to educate herself in Latin or Greek. In ‘Upon my Son speaking Latin to less advanta[ge] than English’, Grierson aims to defend Barber’s lack of Latin by arguing that Phoebus’s refusal to allow her a classical education had far-reaching, disruptive effects. By denying Barber, Grierson suggests that Con has been denied Latin instruction that could have taken place in the home. Without Barber’s advice and instruction, her son, Con, must also suffer.

Grierson’s advocacy of Barber’s literary skill strengthens her defence. Despite Barber’s deficiency in classical languages, she combines both ‘Virgil’s Purity’, and ‘Ovid’s Ease’. Barber’s mind is ‘adorn’d with tuneful Numbers’; she has a ‘Sense refin’d’ and her poetry bears ‘ev’ry Elegance of Thought and Phrase’. Grierson’s reference to Virgil and Ovid

⁹⁰ Swift, Poems, 1: 77-8. See also Barbara McGovern, Anne Finch and Her Poetry (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1992), 94-5.  
¹⁰ Barber, Poems, 89.
and her attempt to place Barber alongside them is important. It allows her to create a
classical, poetic lineage for Barber. The final quatrain brings Grierson’s argument to a
striking conclusion in its suggestion that, if Barber had Latin, her prodigious talents could
eclipse even the deities of the classical canon:

For, if like them, she could unfold her Mind
In Language understood by all Mankind;
Their matchless Fame, thro’ many Ages won,
(Her Sex might boast) would be in one outdone.\(^{92}\)

It may seem curious, or even uncharitable, that Grierson should point at Barber’s limitations
regarding Latin. However, Grierson utilises this technique in order to defend Barber: by
imagining an alternative, if exaggerated, literary history for Barber, Grierson asserts that her
lack of Latin is irrelevant to her poetic ability. Grierson’s defence of Barber is an effective —
albeit problematic — defence, mainly because it was blatant exaggeration, but also because it
cannot be conclusively proven or challenged (Barber was never taught Latin). What we are
left with at the end of Grierson’s poem is not a powerful son, but a powerful mother, who is
being constructed as if she were a classical hero who is denied her final triumph.

**Barber, Grierson and Martha Percival**

Thus far, this chapter has considered the ways in which Barber and Grierson used the
medium of verse to support and vindicate each other on a public as well as a personal level.
Both poets also used poetry as a means to engage the support of another woman, Martha
Percival. To understand Barber’s preoccupation with seeking patronage from Martha
Percival, we need to examine Percival’s connections through marriage. Born Martha Ussher,
her first marriage to Nehemiah Donnellan left her with considerable wealth, while her second
marriage to Philip Percival, who was educated with another of Barber’s patrons, Lord

\(^{92}\) Barber, *Poems*, 89.
Carteret, earned her the courtesy title ‘Honourable’. Mrs. Percival was mother to Anne and Catherine Donnellan, wife of Rev. Robert Clayton, Bishop of Killala, to whom Barber dedicated further poems. (For a further discussion of these subscribers see Chapter 4.) Mrs. Percival’s friendship with Mary Pendarves, later Delany, further set her in Dublin’s social elite. According to Elias, Percival was famous for her social engagements in London. She hosted concerts, soirées and indulged her husband’s musical interests.\(^93\) She was seen as a good wife, mother to a talented family, and — while neither Percival’s diaries nor Delany’s Memoirs say much about her individual accomplishments — Laetitia Pilkington’s description certainly suggests an appreciation of Percival:

a Lady of most universal Genius, there being no one Accomplishment which adorns a Woman of Quality but what she possesst; and her Station gave her an Opportunity of shewing them to Advantage; she was also extremely happy in her Family; her Husband was a most worthy Gentleman; both her Sons Men of Sense and Honour, and one of her Daughters very agreeable; it may easily be suppos’d this Belle Assembly engaged the Company of all the learned and polite World; every Night was a Drawing-Room, and the ingenious and curious of both Sexes went Home delighted and improved.\(^94\)

Martha Percival’s ‘Station’, her impeccable family connections and her easy sociability made her an ideal patron. However, she was not merely a well-connected socialite; she also displayed a genuine interest in patronising the arts. Pilkington suggests an appreciation of intellectual and artistic pursuits. Her glowing appraisal had something to do, perhaps, with Percival’s subscription to Matthew Pilkington’s Poems on Several Occasions (1730). Her artistic benevolence was particularly conspicuous in her support of working-class poets and religious works. She subscribed, among other works, to ‘Thresher Poet’ Stephen Duck’s Poems on Several Occasions (1736) and Mary Leapor’s Poems on Several Occasions (1748). She also subscribed to Barber’s collection, along with several other members of her family (see Chapter 4).


There is further evidence to suggest that Percival was not merely a subscriber but took a serious interest in philosophy and improvement. Grierson sent her a copy of Francis Hutcheson’s latest treatise, *An Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue; in two Treatises* (1725) to her with the following poem ‘To the Hon. Mrs Percival, with Hutcheson’s [sic] Treatise on Beauty and Order’:

> Th’ internal Senses painted here we see:  
> They’re born in others, but they live in thee  
> O were our Author with thy Converse blest,  
> Could he behold the Virtues of thy Breast;  
> His needless Labour with Contempt he’d view;  
> And bid the World not read – but copy you!  

Hutcheson’s argument maintains that we are endowed with a special ‘internal’ sense by which we perceive beauty, harmony and proportion, and an internal moral sense by which we perceive virtue. Grierson praises Percival’s exemplary possession of these senses and posits her as a model to which others should also aspire.

Percival’s family was also heavily involved with George Berkeley’s Bermuda Scheme (1724-1730). Berkeley’s proposition — to re-create an earthly paradise in the New World through the foundation of a missionary college in Bermuda — generated much excitement in a society that was economically and socially shattered in the wake of the South Sea Bubble stock market crash in 1720. Upon his arrival in London in 1720 following a series of continental tours, the Irish philosopher George Berkeley was horrified to witness the crises associated with the South Sea Bubble (1720), the first great stock market crash in British history. Berkeley’s response to this debacle, *An Essay towards Preventing the Ruin of Great Barbers*, Poems, 155.

Britain (1721), suggested that the nation was standing on the edge of a moral precipice. Citing the lack of individual ethics, the breakdown of religion and the prevalence of luxury, Berkeley argued that ethical corruption was sapping the nation’s strength, evidence that the British and Irish were the first people ‘who have been wicked upon principle’.  

Fearing that this corruption could not be overcome simply through words, Berkeley turned his attention to a new project: the foundation of a missionary college in Bermuda. Having briefly considered Barbados, Berkeley rejected it in a second, later work on the topic, claiming that a place of ‘so high Trade, so much Wealth and Luxury, and such dissolute Morals ... must at first sight seem a very improper Situation for a general Seminary intended for forming Missionaries, and educating Youth in Religion and Sobriety of Manners.’ Bermuda, on the other hand, was conveniently located close to British colonies and was ideal because of the absence of moral temptations and other possible distractions. The island of Bermuda itself was often cited as a potential site of virtue within the New World. The tale of Admiral Somers’s miraculous survival and deliverance after his shipwreck on the island in 1609 served as a powerful symbol for a number of English writers. In a variety of texts ranging from Shakespeare’s Tempest to Marvell’s ‘Bermudas’ (1657) the island was presented as the scene of possible regeneration within the New World. In his own Proposal, Berkeley cites one of these texts, Edmund Waller’s The Battle of Summer Islands (1645), as a source for his description of the island and to stress Bermuda’s idyllic nature.

As early as 1722, Berkeley determined that the most appealing prospects for future development lay in the New World. In a letter to his close friend, Sir John Percival (brother-in-law to Martha Percival), he confessed that it ‘is now about ten months since I have determined with myself to spend the residue of my days in the island of Bermuda, where I

---

98 George Berkeley, A Proposal for the Better Supplying of Churches in our Foreign Plantations and for Converting the Savage Americans to Christianity (London, 1725), 8.
trust in Providence I may be the mean instrument of doing good to mankind’. At the core of Berkeley’s missionary project was the desire to use his college (to be named St. Paul’s) to instruct clergymen in strategies designed for ‘propagating Christianity among the Savages’. Even more ambitiously, Berkeley imagined that this institution would provide religious training to natives. At the heart of his plan was a belief that, by co-opting Native American youths and raising them as ‘civilised’ Europeans, they would later serve as ideal emissaries to their original peoples: they were a blank slate upon which Anglican doctrine could be etched. Among Berkeley scholars, his involvement in this plan has been seen as evidence of his piety, as in Luce’s claim that ‘he was clearly something of a saint’.

Berkeley’s concern for virtue, and its fleeting nature, may be seen in ‘America, or the Muse’s Refuge’, written at the height of his enthusiasm for Bermuda. Here, Berkeley pointed to the decay of Europe and the ‘rise of Empire and the Arts’ in the ‘west’.

In pursuing his Bermuda venture, Berkeley lobbied friends and government officials and worked tirelessly to persuade the public of his scheme’s value. To this end, in 1725 he published his plan: *A Proposal for the Better Supplying of Churches in Our Foreign Plantations*. This outlined the practical aspects of Berkeley’s design and sought to persuade readers of its necessity. As popular excitement grew, Berkeley’s vision moved toward actuality: financial subscriptions were taken and volunteers began to appear. However, despite his best efforts and an auspicious beginning, Berkeley’s scheme ran aground upon political controversy and was eventually abandoned. While Berkeley was able to raise significant sums from private subscriptions (£3,400 by the end of the year), delays — including the approval of the royal grant, opposition in Cabinet and complications over the government’s sale of the St. Christopher’s lands — plagued the scheme. Most significantly,

---


Walpole’s failure to honour his £20,000 pledge dashed all hopes of the scheme’s completion.104

The Percival family were early converts to the Bermuda Scheme. Martha’s husband, Philip Percival, wrote to his brother, John: ‘and as some of my family are Invalids, and the Bermuda Air is a cure for most distempers, particularly the Cholick, Berkeley has found it no hard matter to make them Proselites’.

Specifically, the proselytes were his wife Martha Percival, and her daughter (from her first marriage), Anne Donnellan. Mrs. Percival’s younger son, the future clergyman, Kit Donnellan and, the wife of her elder son Nehemiah Donnellan, were all greatly excited by the scheme. Laetitia Pilkington, whom Swift later accused of being ‘once Bermudas mad’ was also involved.106

In the context of Percival’s connections, then, it is not surprising that both Barber and Grierson addressed poems to her. Barber’s poem, ‘To the Honourable Mrs. Percival’, and Grierson’s ‘To Mrs. Percival on her desisting from the Bermudan Project’ were coupled in Barber’s Poems. Although undated, it is likely that they were written at the height of Berkeley’s plan, sometime between 1725 and 1730. The poems illustrate these women’s attempts to engage with public topics and navigate the patronage system through verse. These poems demonstrate the extent to which Barber and Grierson influenced each other’s work. They both idealise Percival as a patron and guardian of the arts. Grierson’s poem is a criticism of corruption. It draws on Berkeley’s preoccupation with virtue and morality in an attempt to persuade Mrs. Percival to remain in Ireland:

Some Guardian Pow’rs, in Pity to our Land,
Your Voyage to the Summer Isles withstand.
Heav’n will by other means convert the West;
And you must make your native Country blest;
Your Business there was but to serve Mankind;
And here, for that, an ample Field you’ll find;
To Virtue, here, may thoughtless Souls persuade,

105 Elias, Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington, 1: 228.
106 Elias, Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington, 1: 228.
Instruct the Ignorant, the Wretched aid.\textsuperscript{107}

Evidently, Grierson is delighted that ‘Providence’ or, more generally, ‘Some Guardian Pow’rs’ have resulted in Percival’s remaining. This sentiment is the reverse of that articulated in Berkeley’s poem, ‘Verses on the Prospect of Planting Arts and Learning in America’, in which he posited the notion of the westward transfer of empire, learning and religion to the New World:

There shall be sung another golden age  
The rise of empire and of arts,  
The good and great inspiring epic rage,  
The wisest heads and noblest hearts.\textsuperscript{108}

From her Irish perspective, Grierson argues that Ireland — more than the New World — desperately needs Percival as a protector of the arts. Like Barber, Grierson also idealises Percival. With her intellect, wealth and connections, she is exactly the sort of person whom Berkeley would have wanted to move to Bermuda. However, Grierson sees her as a potential guardian of virtue and learning in Ireland itself. Here, Percival can defend virtue and persuade ‘thoughtless Souls’, ‘instruct the Ignorant’ and aid the Wretched. Grierson’s plea – ‘Haste then, o haste! Return and bless our Eyes, / No more the Call of Providence despise’ – reinforces the pressing need for Percival to remain in Ireland.\textsuperscript{109} The reality was, of course, that there was always a threat that the ‘good and the great’ would leave Ireland for other shores. This can partially explain Barber’s preoccupation with constancy and her desire to address Percival as both friend and patron in the hope that intimate ties would encourage Percival to stay. Grierson’s poem then shifts its focus to the possibility that Percival might leave Ireland for England. The latter half of the poem is a scathing indictment of England’s ill

\textsuperscript{107} Barber, Poems, 138.  
\textsuperscript{108} George Berkeley, ‘Verses on the Prospect of Planting Arts and Learning in America’, 366.  
\textsuperscript{109} Barber, Poems, 138.
treatment of Ireland:

Let others still near Albion’s Court reside,
Who sacrifice their Country to their Pride,
And squander vast Estates at Balls and Play,
While public Debts increase, and Funds decay;
While the starv’d Hind with Want distracted lives,
Nor tastes the Plenty, which his Labour gives.
Let those alone to foreign Countries stray,
Who, with their Wealth, their follies take away.
Whatever such may act, where-e’er they go,
Do thou return to mitigate our Woe.\(^{110}\)

It has been well documented how the majority of peers with Irish titles lived for most of the time outside Ireland.\(^{111}\) Many had tenuous Irish links, or, if periodically living in Ireland, moved easily and frequently between the two kingdoms. Affluent Irish peers such as the earl of Egmont did well in England. However, their absence from Ireland meant that their influence there was limited and indirect. The absent were largely ignored, or derided for their selfishness, the present were also censured for their failings. Hopefuls from Ireland went to England where, it was supposed preferment was more easily gained. This situation reminded people of the subservience of Ireland to England. It also widened the gulf between the lucky with useful connections in England and the means to activate them, and the generality within Ireland who had to rely on intermediaries closer at hand. Anti-English feelings coalesced with anti-aristocratic sentiments, and the sale of Irish titles to English, Welsh and Scottish peers especially worsened the problems of absenteeism. Barnard has documented how in 1729, when absenteeees were first publicly inventoried, twenty-six peers headed the shaming catalogue. Another fourteen were absent from Ireland for all but a couple of months, with a further five as occasional absenteeees. In all, about a third of the Irish peerage seldom or never

\(^{110}\) Barber, Poems, 138.
\(^{111}\) For a full discussion on absenteeism in Ireland during this period see Toby Barnard, The Kingdom of Ireland, 1641-1760 (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2004); Toby Barnard, A New Anatomy of Ireland: The Irish Protestants, 1649–1770 (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2003), 21-40.
took their places in local society. The cost of bilocation quickly depleted the assets of even the most affluent, as a decision to lavish money on a country estate in England rather than on their Irish properties could be a significant financial drain on the wealthiest families.\textsuperscript{112} As Grierson points out in her poem to Martha Percival above, the remittance of rents to English-based absenteeees depleted the Irish economy of capital.

In her poem, Grierson makes a strong distinction between the commercially-interested and pleasure-seeking elite and the metaphorical wealth represented by the genuine support of virtuous people like Martha Percival. In the face of a breakdown of religious and moral foundations, Ireland was in a desperate situation and Percival is a champion who must return to help the nation. In a final attack on England’s treatment of Ireland, Grierson’s verse states the effects of the draining of funds and talent (human resources) to England:

\begin{quote}
Our Gold may flow to Albion with each Tide;  
But let them with that Gold be satisfy’d:  
The Want of that we long have learnt to bear,  
But Souls like thine accomplish’d cannot spare.\textsuperscript{113}
\end{quote}

Grierson’s biting criticism of the English exploitation of Ireland underlines the constant threat that Ireland’s most influential people and capital would go to England. It bears Swift’s influence, as the Drapier, in its plea to look after people at home. If Berkeley wished to start afresh in the West, Swift, Grierson and Barber wanted to remedy existing ills at home. For Barber, this situation would hold personal resonance. The draining of funds and talent from Ireland meant that she was forced to travel to England to seek subscriptions. Ultimately, this delayed the publication of her \textit{Poems}. Indeed, Mrs. Percival, who had travelled between Dublin and London for several years, ultimately died in England.

Barber’s poem reflects a more intimate engagement with Percival as a supporter; she

\textsuperscript{112} Barnard notes how by the early eighteenth century, wealthy Irish peers such as Palmerston, Mountrath and Egmont, acquired town houses in London as well as English country seats. Barnard, \textit{A New Anatomy of Ireland}, 21-40, 37.

\textsuperscript{113} Barber, \textit{Poems}, 138.
uses this as an opportunity to criticise abuses within the patronage system. The poem prefigures the way in which Barber would approach aristocratic women in England. This poem is a testing ground for this type of verse and it is successful. In ‘To the Honourable Mrs. Percival’, Barber constructs a relationship in which the patron acts as both friend and protector, who supports her through practical, tangible means such as acquiring subscriptions on her behalf, as well as through intangible means such as friendship:

And will your Goodness never have an End?
And will you still persist to be my Friend?
To meet me still with that engaging Air,
Still open, ardent, gen’rous, and sincere;
Still to advise, to aid, to cheer, bless,
Still to prevent, or to dispel Distress;
Sollicit for me with unweary’d Zeal,
Pleas’d to succeed, not slacken’d when you fail;
Point out each Path to good Success from far,
And guide me by thy Light, my happier Star.\footnote{Barber, Poems, 122.}

Here, Barber’s choice of adjectives and verbs illustrates the tangible and intangible qualities of the ideal patronage relationship. On the one hand, Percival will ‘advise’, aid, and — most importantly — ‘solicit’ for Barber. On the other, less tangibly and more intimately, Percival will ‘cheer’, ‘bless’ and ‘dispel Distress.’ Percival instructs Barber on the right path, but also helps to bring her there: ‘Point out each Path to good Success from far, / And guide me by thy Light, my happier Star’. Percival was not merely a passive benefactor, she was also active and instrumental in getting others to support Barber. This gives Barber and Percival’s relationship a layer of intimacy beyond the simple donation of funds. The language Barber uses contrasts with her address to male patrons which was always formal and more rigid, and of course, less intimate in its expression.

More importantly, Percival does not desert Barber even when there is little chance of return on her investment in the poet. To borrow Shakespeare’s phrase, Percival is ‘true-fix’d’,
constant in both success and failure.\textsuperscript{115} This is reflected in Barber’s repetition of the word ‘still’ and her direct reference to Percival as one ‘fix’d Friend’. Percival provides a contrast with Barber’s male patrons, who had been quicker to remove their support. When his viceroyalty ended, Lord Carteret returned to England; Swift had a difficult and conflicted relationship to the patronage system, as did the earl of Orrery. Patrick Delany, who had also provided Barber with support, was occupied with seeking patronage for his own works. Moreover, subscribers to volumes could be fickle in their support at the best of times. Barber addresses this in her poem by contrasting Percival’s constant support with the apathy she has encountered elsewhere:

\begin{quotation}
When of ungen’rous Minds I Favours ask,
And sink, oppress’d beneath the grievous Task,
Here the false Promise, or the feigned Excuse,
In Words that mean but more refin’d Abuse.\textsuperscript{116}
\end{quotation}

For Barber and Berkeley, Percival’s presence as the ideal patron, and Bermuda, a paradise unsullied by moral, financial or intellectual corruption, were ideals towards which to aspire. More importantly, Grierson and Barber’s poems to Percival point to a larger question about the role of friendship in patronage. Using Percival as a case study reflects the ways in which Barber and Grierson supported and influenced each other to demonstrate how the terms of patronage could be manipulated by authors to include friendship. As we have seen here, Barber petitioned Percival as friend and patron, but it was really Grierson who shared, shaped and supported Barber’s work, becoming as important — if not more so — than the male and female patrons to which Barber dedicated her poems.

In his discussion of the patrons and protégés of Swift’s Dublin, Irvin Ehrenpreis observed that ‘one of Mary Barber’s closest friends, and perhaps the person responsible for

\textsuperscript{115} William Shakespeare, \textit{Julius Caesar}, Act 3, Scene 1: ‘But I am constant as the northern star,/ Of whose true-fixed and resting quality / There is no fellow in the firmament.’ (London: Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 1998), 346.

\textsuperscript{116} Barber, \textit{Poems}, 122.
her literary ambitions, was Constantia Grierson, wife of George, a Dublin printer.\textsuperscript{117} Both women had an important role in establishing and controlling the other’s public reception and reputation. Grierson’s education, talent and connections also equipped her to serve as a shrewd judge of literary merit, which she used to authenticate Barber’s poetry and vindicate Barber’s subscription process. Her early death enabled Barber’s posthumous appropriation of her celebrity and further provided distinct opportunity for Barber to enact the role of patron herself which she grasped by anthologising Grierson’s poems in her own volume. The poetic exchange between both women was not only personal: both approached Martha Percival in a joint effort to engage the public sphere and establish connections. Their poems to Martha Percival on Berkeley’s Bermuda Scheme show how women could take poetry from the domestic, personal exchange sphere to the sphere of public debate. More importantly, for Barber, this poetry prefigures her approach to female subscribers in England and anticipates the important role women would play in the subscription and publication of her Poems.

\textsuperscript{117} Ehrenpreis, \textit{Swift}, 3: 636.
Chapter 3: Modes of subscription publication: Analysing the subscription list to Barber’s *Poems on Several Occasions* (1734)

Mary Barber published her *Poems on Several Occasions* by subscription in London in June 1735.\(^1\) It was among the first collections of poetry by a woman to be published by subscription, and it recorded more names on its illustrious list of 918 subscribers than any volume of poetry since Matthew Prior’s folio in 1718.\(^2\) This impressive list, comprising names of important political, cultural and literary figures, indicates Barber’s extensive participation in Dublin and London social circles, and yields substantial information about women’s literary relationships and their penetration of print culture. This chapter contextualises and describes Barber’s subscription list in order to cast light on its social context.

Firstly, it is useful to define subscription publication and how it functioned in an eighteenth-century context. According to Sarah Clapp, the first subscription publication can be traced back as far as 1617, but the practice was established as the main means of publishing a single author’s work only in the early to mid-eighteenth century.\(^3\) Traditionally,

\(^1\) Mary Barber, *Poems on Several Occasions* (London: for C. Rivington, 1734). The volume did not appear until June 1735, despite the date on the title page. This was owing to circumstances surrounding Barber’s arrest for her implication in the importation of Swift’s *Epistle to a Lady* into London, published by Benjamin Motte on 26 November 1733. On 2 February 1734, Barber was arrested on the information of Matthew Pilkington and was obliged to attend the court until the summons was informally dropped on 19 May 1735. On 27 May 1735, Barber was officially discharged from the summons and three weeks later, the *Daily Journal* advertised the delivery of the subscription quarto (for a full discussion of Barber’s arrest, see Chapter 5).

\(^2\) Barber’s *Poems* was the third volume of poetry by a woman to be published by subscription, and the fifth volume by a woman to appear by subscription in any genre. The first two female-authored books published by subscription are Elizabeth Elstob, *An Anglo-Saxon Homely* (London, 1709), and Eliza Haywood, *Letters from a Lady of Quality to a Chevalier* (London, 1721; repr. 1724). Matthew Prior’s *Poems on Several Occasions* (London, 1718) recorded 1,446 subscribers for 1,778 copies. Adam Budd erroneously claims that Barber’s was the second female-authored verse collection to be published by subscription, but he overlooks Mary Masters, *Poems on Several Occasions* (1733) and Jean Adam’s *Miscellany Poems* (1734). Adam Budd, ‘‘Merit in Distress’: The Troubled Success of Mary Barber’, *The Review of English Studies* 53.210 (2002): 204-27. See Bill Overton, ‘The Subscription List for Jean Adam’s *Miscellany Poems* (1734)’, *Notes and Queries* 51.4 (2004): 393.

\(^3\) According to Clapp, Minsheu’s *Ductor in linguas* (1617) is the first known work to contain a printed list of subscribers. However, the record of its successors is so obscure that the usual assertion of literary historians has been that Tonson’s edition of *Paradise Lost* (London, 1688) was the second book issued by subscription. Sarah Clapp, ‘The Beginnings of Subscription Publication in the Seventeenth Century’, *Modern Philology: A Journal Devoted to Medical Research in Medieval and Modern Literature*, 29 (1931): 205.
authors sought support from an individual, preferably influential, patron at court. In the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, merchant classes eager to distinguish themselves through their collections of art and literature, as well as coffee-house enthusiasts, helped to open up a cultural market for books and, for the first time, authors began consciously marketing their talents for a public readership.\(^4\) David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleery have observed how this ‘rise of a reading public (with interests in and ability to pay for printed works), created circumstances whereby authors moved from creating works with a view to soliciting funds and support from a given patron, to seeking publication through subscriptions and advance payment schemes’.\(^5\) The subscriber represented the patron, not as the commissioner of the work, but as one of its consumers: a conspicuously identified member of the reading public. The time-honoured ‘Link of patronage which held the Great and Learned together’ was adapted to form a more ‘democratised system of patronage’, in the subscription list.\(^6\) In early eighteenth-century Britain and Ireland, subscription books were published using a method in which the production cost was underwritten by advance purchase agreement from buyers subscribing for one or more copies of the projected book. The author would propose a book of a specified matter, length, and format, and then solicited subscriptions personally, either directly or through friends or agents. Authors sought support through patrons, friends and self-promotion in the drawing rooms and assemblies of the great. For writers, subscription publication enabled them to engage not one, but several influential and prominent persons from various sections of society. Subscribers usually paid half the price at the time of the subscription, and the remainder on delivery, and their names were printed at

\(^4\) In the early eighteenth century, reading became a shared experience in the coffee-houses of London and Dublin, and the book was seen as a commodity to be bought and sold. See John Barrell, ‘Coffee-House Politicians’, *Journal of British Studies* 43 (2004): 206-33.


the front of the volume. The object of subscription was to secure down-payments, and promises to purchase a book before its publication. This ensured that production and distribution costs were covered before a work went to press, an arrangement that pleased booksellers because it minimised risks and could augur large profits. The first decade of the century saw about forty books published in this way. That number doubled to ninety-one during the next ten years. For the rest of the century, the average per decade ran around 250. Works published thus ranged from poetry, novels, plays, histories and biography, to medical texts and advice manuals, theology, mathematical works and other non-literary texts.

We do not know how many copies of Barber’s collection were sold, but we do know that the cost of her quarto edition was expensive, at one guinea per copy. If Barber could collect the customary half-guinea from each of her subscribers at the time of signing (553 guineas) she would have cleared a considerable sum of money, even after the costs of printing were paid. She secured the confidence of both Samuel Richardson and Charles Rivington, who agreed to print and sell her collection and subscribe into the bargain. Richardson further enlisted his brother-in-law, the bookseller, James Leake, for another copy.

---


8 Brewer, The Pleasures of the Imagination, 164.

9 According to Thomas Lockwood, the total number of books published by subscription between 1701 and 1801 reached at least 2,000 and probably more like 3,000. Lockwood, ‘Subscription-hunters’, 121-22. Data produced by F. J. G. Robinson, P. J. Wallis, and R. Wallis indicated a total of 3,912 books known by 1996 to have been published in this form; a few among this total were published outside Britain, though with British subscribers. See Revised Guide and P. J. and R. Wallis, Book Subscription Lists: Extended Supplement to the Revised Guide (Newcastle Upon Tyne: Project for Historical Biobibliography, 1996), viii.

10 Daily Gazetteer, 22 March 1736.

In the early eighteenth century, Irish writers in English tended to look to England to escape the restrictions of an unadventurous Dublin book trade. During this period, relatively few original works (aside from those by Swift) were published in Dublin; most Dublin-published titles consisted of translations of Greek and Roman classics, religious texts and government tracts. Dublin publishers and booksellers tended to have fewer pecuniary resources at their disposal than their London counterparts and simply could not afford to take risks on new or lesser-known authors. Thus, authors were often responsible for funding the publication of their own work.\textsuperscript{12} For unknown writers like Barber, subscription was often the only way to get texts into print. Matthew Pilkington also chose to publish his \textit{Poems on Several Occasions} (1730) by subscription in both Dublin and London.

Furthermore, while no copyright laws existed in Ireland at this time, the English book trade offered legal protection for writers’ published works. As Mary Pollard has explained, the Copyright Act of 1709 in England and Scotland gave authors the right to sell their work to a bookseller: once bought, the text was protected — in theory — for a limited period, within the country of publication.\textsuperscript{13} However, this law did not extend to Ireland, which meant that the work of writers who published in Ireland was vulnerable to literary piracy. In a letter to London printer and bookseller, Benjamin Motte, on the subject of printing his works in Dublin, Swift noted: ‘I believe I have told you, that no Printer or Bookseller hath any sort of property [copyright] here.’\textsuperscript{14} Writing seven months later from Dublin, Swift explained to Pope how:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{12} Toby Barnard, ‘Print in Eighteenth-Century Ireland: Varieties and Variations’ (lecture, University College Dublin, 18 May 2010). For further discussion of print practices in eighteenth-century Britain and Ireland see also Richard B. Sher, \textit{The Enlightenment and the Book: Scottish Authors and their Publications in Eighteenth-Century Britain, Ireland and America} (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006), 443-67.
  \item \textsuperscript{14} Swift to Benjamin Motte, Dublin, 4 November 1732, Swift, \textit{Corr.} 3: 556.
\end{itemize}
A Printer came to me to desire he might print my works (as he called them) in 4 volumes by Subscription ... I wish it could be done in England, rather than here, although I am grown perfectly indifferent to every thing of that kind. This is the very truth of the story. There is no Property among Printers here, neither will it be one farthing in my Pocket; For among us, mony for Copys is a thing unheard of.\(^\text{15}\)

As a result, Irish authors — like Barber — preferred to publish their works in London, and many were willing to uproot themselves completely and relocate to England in the expectation that they could earn royalties from exposure to a wider audience, while protecting the integrity of their works. Between 1691 and the middle of the 1700s, writers including Thomas Southerne, Jonathan Swift, Richard Steele, George Farquhar, Mary Davys, Thomas Parnell and George Berkeley went to England. Matthew Pilkington also sought preferment and publication in London. Southerne, Steele and Farquhar moved early to England and stayed there. For some women, personal circumstances impinged on their decision to relocate to England. Following the death of her husband in 1700, Mary Davys (1674–1732) — another protégé of Swift — went to Cambridge, where she earned a living running a coffee-house, writing plays, novels and some poetry. Davys’s case demonstrates that it was possible for women to write, publish and succeed in England. In 1716, her play *The Northern Heiress* (a play critical of the marriage market) was produced in London. The proceeds went to establishing her coffee-house, and Davys continued her literary endeavours with the encouragement of local students and intellectuals. Her novel, *The Reformed Coquette*, was sold by subscription in 1724; Pope and Gay were among the subscribers. Like several other women of the time, Davys was criticised for taking up her pen, but she hit back at her detractors in the preface to her *Works* (1725), where she observed acidly that ‘a Woman left to her own Endeavours for Twenty-seven Years together, may well be allow’d to catch any Opportunity for that Bread which they that condemn her would very probably deny to give

---

\(^{15}\) Swift to Pope, Dublin, 1 May 1733, Swift, *Corr.* 3: 638.
her’. In 1730, Barber became part of this wave of authors and later planned to relocate her family (see Chapter 4).

As Brewer has observed, a well-managed subscription list could prove sufficiently popular and profitable to secure an author’s financial independence. Before the expiration of the Licensing Act in 1695, booksellers purchased a book outright in exchange for providing funds for initial publication. For a set period, the author received no further payment regardless of how well the book sold. Pope’s decision to publish his Greek translations by subscription began to redress the balance between bookseller and author. He famously made a success of the method with his translation of the Iliad (1720), which received an immense £6,000. In effect, Pope became his own publisher, freeing himself from what he viewed as the clutches of the booksellers, and shifting the system in favour of the writer. His success was to prove compelling and seductive to authors throughout the century. It proved that subscription helped get into print expensive and scholarly tomes which might otherwise never have been published. Joseph Trapp’s translation of the Aeneid (1720) and Elizabeth Singer Rowe’s translation of Lucan’s Pharsalia (1719) were also successful subscription publications. Elizabeth Carter’s translation from the Greek of All the Works of Epictetus (London, 1758), with its 1,200 subscribers, earned her almost £1,000, enabling her to devote the rest of her life to her Bluestocking literary interests. The 918-strong subscription to Barber’s Poems (twenty-three years earlier than Carter’s translation) was in itself an enormous triumph for a woman who, at the time of her subscription, was both chronically infirm and a draper’s wife.

---

While most writers would not gain financial freedom by subscription publication, and many found the manner of collecting subscribers distasteful, there remained the promise that it would ensure publication by underwriting costs. Although subscription publication was especially suitable for expensive books and weighty translations published in multiple volumes, it became a useful means for women writers to get their work into print. During the early eighteenth century, women still expressed some difficulties in representing themselves creatively through the printed word. While men were free to use an ‘economy of favour’ through which poetical translations, political or educational material dedicated to specific patrons could serve as the means to a political or ecclesiastical career, these paths were closed to women. As delineated in Chapter 1, the difficulties surrounding a clear definition of patronage, and what it meant to an eighteenth-century author, impinged on women writers in a very particular way. Some women hesitated to enter into an arrangement whereby they implicitly engaged to exchange ‘benefits’ with a patron — especially a male patron — or to accept his protection, at a time when the word ‘protection’ was also recognised as a euphemism for sexual ‘keeping’. For women, subscription offered a means to secure publication without risking their reputations and, as Roger Lonsdale observes, by ‘the 1730s ... it became normal for women to publish volumes of their verse by subscription’. Many women writers throughout the century — including novelists Eliza Haywood, Sarah Fielding and Charlotte Lennox; Anglo-Saxon scholar Elizabeth Elstob; poets Mary Masters, Jean Adam, Mary Collier, Mary Leapor, Sarah Dixon, and, of course, Mary Barber – used the subscription method to publish their works.

The first volume of poetry by a woman to appear by subscription was Mary Masters’s *Poems on Several Occasions*, published in London in 1733. Masters, a poet of humble origins

---

from Norwich, dedicated several of her poems and letters to proto-feminist issues — including the vagaries of courtship and marriage, and women’s intellectual equality.\textsuperscript{23} Although Masters’s father endeavoured ‘to prevent [her] from acquiring the use of the Pen’, since he maintained that ‘Writing could only qualify [women] for intrigue’, Masters achieved an impressive 721 subscribers for her first publication, which helped establish her literary presence.\textsuperscript{24} She followed this with a second collection, \textit{Familiar Letters and Poems on Several Occasions}, also published by subscription, in London in 1755. In the preface to this collection, Masters gives her reasons for the twenty-two year gap between the two publications, contrasting the prosperity and comfort she enjoyed from her first subscription with the pressing difficulties preceding her final publication:

\begin{quote}
I was, in the early Part of my Life, persuaded to increase my little Stock by a Subscription, in which I succeeded beyond my Merit, and for a while lived contented and quiet; but the Death of some Friends, and the Treachery of others, rendered my Situation very inconvenient and uncomfortable. In Hopes of redressing it, I was prevailed upon to make a second Attempt, several Gentlemen and Ladies assuring me they would not only honour me with their own Names, but use their utmost Influence in my Favour.\textsuperscript{25}
\end{quote}

Masters’s explanation demonstrates that subscription was a practicable method of publishing for women. In real terms, it was a means of earning considerable sums of money, but it also afforded a solution to a variety of personal dilemmas.

Barber was not unlike Masters in her attempt to supplement her own family’s income through her writing. By the early 1730s, she appears to have been the primary wage-earner of a family whose head was often unemployed. That so little is heard of her husband, Rupert Barber, has led some biographers to assume that he was dead by 1733.\textsuperscript{26} From at least 1730,

\textsuperscript{24} Mary Masters, \textit{Familiar Letters and Poems on Several Occasions} (London, 1755), iii.
\textsuperscript{25} Mary Masters, \textit{Familiar Letters and Poems}, iii-iv.
\textsuperscript{26} Ehrenpreis and Lonsdale believe Barber’s husband (whose first name has been established as Rupert, and not Jonathan as is often reported) to have been dead by 1733, but Elias points out that Mary Barber’s obituary in the \textit{Dublin Journal} 14/17 (June 1755), shows Rupert Barber to have survived her. See Elias, \textit{Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington}, 2: 391-92; Ehrenpreis, \textit{Swift}, 3: 635-36; Lonsdale, \textit{Eighteenth-Century Women Poets}, 118-19.
Barber was obliged to shoulder the costs incurred by her eldest son, who was studying at Trinity College Dublin, as well as to fund the endeavours of her two younger sons, who would also undertake costly apprenticeships. She suffered poor health (letters refer to her chronic and disabling attacks of gout and asthma). Barber’s supporters, Patrick and Mary Delany, feared that her death would leave her children — whom Patrick Delany described as ‘excellently educated, perfectly well-disposed, and utterly unprovided for’ — destitute.

Having lost her close friend and mentor, Constantia Grierson, just three years before the publication of her Poems, Barber would also have understood Masters’s grief over the ‘Death of some Friends’. The second volume of poetry by a woman to appear by subscription was Jean Adam’s Miscellany Poems, published in Glasgow in 1734. Adam was born at Cartsdyke, in Greenock, Scotland. In the short dedication, ‘To the Reader’, which prefaces her volume, explains that she lost her father at a young age and was educated by a local minister. This religious education was reflected in her eighty-poem miscellany, which she was later encouraged to publish for a Scottish Presbyterian audience. The collection was printed with the aid of Mr. Drummond — a customs and excise collector in Greenock — who retrieved Adam’s scattered manuscripts and helped raised a subscription of 153 names for

---

27 In 1730, all of Barber’s children were under the age of sixteen: Constantine was born in 1714, Rupert in 1719, Mira born in 1717; Lucius in 1720. Elias, Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkinson, 2: 391.
29 Mary Masters, Familiar Letters and Poems, iii-iv.
30 Overton cites Adam’s Miscellany Poems (Glasgow, 1734) as the second volume of poetry by a woman to be published by subscription. Adam Budd erroneously claims that Mary Barber’s was the second female-authored verse collection to be published by subscription. Overton, ‘The Subscription List for Jean Adam’s Miscellany Poems (1734)’, 392-93. See also Budd, ‘Merit in Distress’, 204.
31 Karina Williamson, ‘Adam, Jean (1704–1765)’, in ODNB, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/103 (accessed 20 August 2013). Bill Overton explains that some biographical details about Adam, which are generally accepted as facts, are incorrect. One example is her name, which appears on her title page as ‘Mrs. Jane Adams’ but, after the dedication, as ‘Jean Adams’. Overton also notes that the Old Parish Register provides her name as Jean Adam and that she was born in 1704 (Old Greenock (Paisley and London: Alexander Gardner, 1886), 144). For clarity, I follow ‘Adam’ when referring to this poet. Overton, ‘The Subscription List for Jean Adam’, 393.
her.\textsuperscript{34} As Overton has observed, Adam’s publication was ‘an unusual event’ given that subscription publishing, especially for verse, was a relatively new venture in Scotland.\textsuperscript{35} Her \textit{Miscellany Poems} is only the fifth work recorded as published by subscription in Glasgow, and the very first such book of verse.\textsuperscript{36}

The publications of Masters, Adam and Barber demonstrate that women were at the forefront of subscription publishing in England and Scotland. The subscription method was particularly suited to women whose social position was disadvantaged; the subscription list illustrated public support, while the preface became the space in which these women could explicate their motives for publication. Subscription lists evidence, in a wide variety of ways, the particular social and cultural positioning of works of literature — in many cases, delineating a characteristic audience or even confirming an agenda.\textsuperscript{37} Subscription publishing was an especially useful method for presenting work to a specific audience — as in the case of Jean Adam’s predominantly religious \textit{Miscellany}. For Barber, England provided the opportunity to gather greater support for her \textit{Poems} — specifically from aristocrats.

\textit{The subscription list to Barber’s Poems on Several Occasions (1734)}

The subscription list to Barber’s \textit{Poems} (1734) reflects a preoccupation with class and status, suggesting that she had ambitions to promote herself socially, or at least, to exploit the prestige associated with the ‘quality’. Gérard Genette uses the term ‘paratext’ to indicate those productions that accompany the text such as the title, preface, and illustrations. These ‘productions surround and extend the text, precisely in order to ensure the text’s presence in

\textsuperscript{34} Williamson, ‘Adam, Jean (1704–1765)’, \textit{ODNB}.
\textsuperscript{35} The earliest Scottish book recorded as published by subscription was at Edinburgh in 1708. Overton, ‘The Subscription List for Jean Adam’, 393.
\textsuperscript{36} Overton, ‘The Subscription List for Jean Adam’, 393.
the world, its reception and consumption in the form of a book.’\textsuperscript{38} A reader cannot be indifferent to a book’s arrangement, or to typographical choices, and to their connection to the text. Building upon Genette’s idea, Lockwood has further observed, how ‘the subscriber list mattered as what we would call ‘paratext’, helping to tell the story of the text and vouching for its significance.’\textsuperscript{39} The double-columned subscription list covers fourteen quarto pages. While not as lavish as a folio edition, Barber’s list was nevertheless designed to impress. It was decorated with an architectural-pictorial head-piece and tail-piece, used principally in quarto or folio publications (see Figures 1 and 2).\textsuperscript{40} The architectural woodcuts used throughout Barber’s \textit{Poems} can be identified as those belonging to Samuel Richardson.\textsuperscript{41} This head-piece also appears at the beginning of the preface to Barber’s \textit{Poems}. Depicting a large decorated urn, full of flowers and foliage, on a draped pedestal, the head-piece evokes poetic prestige. This urn is flanked by two peacocks, each perched on pedestals, which branch into further foliation (see Figure 1). The peacock is a particularly potent choice to use as a crest for Barber’s subscription list. Traditionally associated with wealth and pride, this bird is characterised by its brilliant plumage and very long tail which can be fanned out for public display. In this head-piece, the peacocks suggest both the illustrious length and distinction of Barber’s subscription list.

The tail-piece is smaller, by design (see Figure 2). According to Phillips, a tail-piece is generally an architectural device which the printer has borrowed from painted ceilings or wall panels.\textsuperscript{42} On Barber’s list, the tail-piece depicts a small, seated male (Cupid) figure surrounded on either side by swags of foliage. The figure is beating a drum; this offers a final

\textsuperscript{39} Lockwood, ‘Subscription-hunters’, 129.
\textsuperscript{42} Philips, \textit{Printing and Bookselling in Dublin}, 245-73.
flourish to mark the end of an impressive roll of names.

The names of subscribers were usually published in a list in the front matter, intended to be read first. From the subscriber’s point of view, this gave the pleasure not only of seeing one’s name gratefully inscribed but also of finding out who else subscribed, how much they spent, and where one belonged in the social scheme of things. Lockwood has noted how the practice of ‘disemvoweling’ personal names in print, out of deference or legal defensiveness but with the obvious understanding that the reader would ‘fill in the blanks’, shows how avidly texts were scanned for names.43

Generally, subscription lists are arranged alphabetically according to surname, under each letter of the alphabet. Barber’s subscription list is arranged in ‘loose’ alphabetical order – the names are collected under each letter of the alphabet; however, they are not strictly alphabetical by surname (see Figure 1). It is possible that the publisher, Charles Rivington, transcribed the list in the order that the names were received. Thus, delays could account for the arrangement of her subscribers. On the final page of her list, a postscript is added, noting the names of a further nine subscribers: ‘Since the above Names were sent to the Press, the following have come to hand’ (see Figure 2).

43 Lockwood, ‘Subscription-hunters’, 123.
A LIST OF THE SUBSCRIBERS

A

DUKE of Argyll
Duchess of Argyll
Duchess Dowager of Anjou

Earl of Arran, 2 Books
Countess of Arran
Countess of Abercorn
Countess of Askham
Lady Ashford
Sir Thomas Aiton, Bart.
Mrs. Aiton, 2 Books
James Aiton, M.D.
Robert Aitken, Esq.
Hon. Colonel John Archer

Francis Annesley, Esq.
Pieces Acourt, Esq.
Mrs. Archer
Robert Atkins, Esq.
Mr. Thomas Aldwinckle, 2 Books
Mr. James Augier, of St. Albans
Mrs. Aprice
Mrs. Aylingcomb
Mrs. Allen
Mrs. Afton
Mrs. Atkins
Mrs. Ashtone
Mrs. Margaret Adams
Sir Gerard Aylmer, Bart.
Patrick Aylmer, Esq.

Fig. 1 (head-piece)
A List of the Subscribers.

Mr. William Wogan
Richard Wemman Esq.
Mr. Worbarston
Charles Hanbury Williams, Esq.
Honourable Colonel Wurburton
Mr. Wilton
Mrs. Anne Waddel
Mrs. Susanna Wats
Mrs. Wolehen
Mr. James Woryadale
Mr. Stephen Winsthope
Mr. Thomas Withford
Captain Thomas Whitney
Mr. John Wilton
Mr. Richard Wilton

Mr. William Wats
Reverend Mr. Samuel Webber
Mr. Hugh White
Mrs. Worrell
Mr. Samuel Warren
Mr. Thomas Wilford.

Sir William Yonge, Knight of the Bath
Reverend Dr. Young
Mrs. Yac.

Since the above Names were sent to the Press, the following have come to Hand.

Mrs. Rebecca Beven
Mrs. Deborah Buckle
Mrs. Anne Barclay
Mrs. Elizabeth Barclay
Mrs. Patience Barclay

Mrs. Elizabeth Clark
Mrs. Anne Elliot
Mr. Millington Hayford
--- Littleton, Esq.

To
Fig. 3 Arrangement of Barber’s subscription list with peers listed first, followed by bishops, etc.
Social hierarchy was usually observed on subscription lists. Barber’s is no exception. Each letter begins with titled subscribers in descending order of rank, before proceeding to commoners. Lockwood has remarked that some subscription lists ‘seem innocent of much representational purpose ... others are pompous and overbearing, carefully arranged for effect, or politically loaded. Some look like a cheering section.’44 However, an investigation of Barber’s subscription list shows that it adheres to the traditional arrangement. Here, the peers of England, Scotland and Ireland are listed first. Bishops rank just below aristocrats, along with subscribers holding senior state offices. These are then followed by those of lower rank (see Figure 3 above).

Of the total 918 names on Barber’s list, 555 subscriptions — or 60% — were made by men, and 363 subscriptions — or 40% — were made by women. The narrow gender divide is notable as Máire Kennedy has observed, women’s names appear less often in subscription lists than men’s, on average amounting to less than one-third of subscribers.45 That the majority of Barber’s poems were dedicated to women accounts for the high number of female subscribers to her volume. The list is overwhelmingly composed of members of the gentry and aristocracy. 131 subscriptions — or 14% of Barber’s list — were made by British and Irish peers. The combined subscriptions from the upper aristocracy and ‘the quality’ total 488 subscribers — just over half — of Barber’s subscription list. The peerage is the legal system of hereditary titles in Britain and Ireland which constitutes the ranks of British nobility. First in precedence comes the duke, followed by the marquess, earl, viscount and baron. These nobles of ‘greatest estate’ were entitled to participate with the monarch in public rituals of sovereignty. They were entitled to occupy an equally lofty role in the business of defining

---
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policy and advising the king or queen. This group was also the focal point for aristocratic
circles of influence and patronage. On a subscription list their names acted as a guarantee of
polite quality. Barber’s subscription list demonstrates her achievement in obtaining the
support of various important peers. Sixty-seven of these subscriptions — or 51% of the total
number of peers – were made by male peers, comprising fourteen dukes, twenty-seven earls,
eight viscounts and eighteen barons. Sixty-four subscriptions — or 49% — were made by
female peers, representing seventeen duchesses, five dowager duchesses, three
marchionesses, twenty-eight countesses, four dowager countesses, six viscountesses and one
dowager viscountess (see Table 1). More specifically, Barber’s list highlighted support from
the three peerage divisions of England, Scotland and Ireland.\footnote{The English and Scottish peerages were separate until the Act of Union of 1707. Each was then closed with future creations made to the peerage of Great Britain. The Irish Peerage remained until the Act of Union of 1801, when it was replaced by the new peerage of the United Kingdom. The Peerage of England comprises all peerages created in the Kingdom of England before the Act of Union in 1707. The Peerage of Scotland was a division of the British Peerage for those peers created in the Kingdom of Scotland before 1707. The Peerage of Ireland represented titles of nobility created by the English monarch of Ireland in his capacity as Lord and King of Ireland. Peers of Ireland rank below peers of England, Scotland and Great Britain and above peers of the United Kingdom of the same rank. See ‘The British Nobility, 1660-1800’, in The European Nobilities in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, ed. H.M. Scott (Harlow: Longman, 1995), 57.} Eighty subscriptions (61%) represented the English peerage, eight (6%) were members of the Scottish peerage, and the
remaining forty-three subscribers (33%) reflected the Irish peerage (see Table 1 below). This
was a significant achievement and was important in establishing Barber’s reputation among
elite, aristocratic circles in England, Scotland and Ireland (see Chapter 4).
Table 1: Subscriptions by peers to Mary Barber’s *Poems on Several Occasions* (1734)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Scottish</th>
<th>Irish</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duke</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viscount</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baron</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Scottish</th>
<th>Irish</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duchess</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dowager Duchess</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchioness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countess</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dowager Countess</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viscountess</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dowager Viscountess</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Robinson and Wallis observe, many subscribers were attracted by ‘the social cachet to be gained from vicarious association with the more noble supporters’.  

Alexander Pope, for example, took much pride in the glitter of his subscriber list and (while he was too knowing to confuse that with the brilliant genius of his work), he was clearly aware of the special éclat certain subscribers brought to his reputation. He wrote to John Caryll: ‘I must own, many of the names in the catalogue [of subscribers] I shall exhibit, are of so great figure, that I should not be much mortified even if I failed in my attempt; while posterity would see me at least, if I was no good poet, I was the happiest poet that ever appeared upon record, in the good opinion of such a number of persons.’

Barber also demonstrated her awareness of the significance of aristocratic support:

I have the highest Sense of the generous Treatment I have met with from many of the Nobility and Gentry of England. Surely there was something truly Noble in their condescending to treat an obscure Person, a Woman, and a Stranger, with so much Goodness, which I shall ever gratefully remember.

The next group on Barber’s subscription list represents what was known in the period as ‘the quality’. Toby Barnard has observed how the noun ‘quality’, like its counterparts, nobility and aristocracy, implied a judgement, and so was not a simple, neutral collective. It was closely connected, and sometimes overlapped with the elusive idea of gentility. The ‘quality’ generally represented a collection of titled (some through inheritance, others through purchase), landed, and sometimes more obscure individuals and their families who had made their way up the ranks of society to acquire powerful positions. Unlike the peerage, with its fixed and legally encoded membership, this category could expand or contract according to a fluid set of criteria variously and inconsistently applied. The application of courtesy titles
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(those who were not peers ‘in their own right’) on Barber’s subscription list demonstrates her sensitivity and desire to be publicly recognised as ‘genteel’. The ‘Honourable Mrs. Percival’ is one such example. Born Martha Ussher, she acquired the courtesy prefix ‘Honourable’ following her marriage to Philip Percival, brother to the earl of Egmont. Although this prefix was never used in speech, its presence on Barber’s subscription list demonstrates the aspirations of a class-conscious and socially mobile society. On Barber’s list, the ‘quality’ accounted for 357 subscriptions — or 39% — of the total. Seventy-two of these are styled as ‘Lady’, and two as ‘Dowager Lady’. This courtesy title was given to the wife of a peer who was not a peeress *suo jure*.

It was also given to the daughters of dukes and marquesses. These women were an important part of Barber’s list, often commanding influence in the drawing-rooms and assemblies of Bath and London. Forty-three of the 357 names are styled ‘Honourable’, a courtesy title which applied to the younger children of earls and all children of viscounts and barons. This title was also given to wives of the younger sons of earls. Three of the 357 names are styled ‘Right Honourable’ – a prefix given to members of the Privy Council of England and Ireland and senior ministers in government. The most conspicuous of these is Sir Robert Walpole, who, in his capacity as Lord Treasurer, Chancellor of the Exchequer and Leader of the House of Commons, was effectively the ‘Prime Minister’ of England (although this position had no recognition in law nor official use at this time).

There are 237 subscriptions to Barber’s *Poems* representing the landed gentry — the untitled landowning upper class, who were deemed ‘well-born’ and of good social position.

---


52 The landed gentry, as the title suggests, represented landowners of large estates. In England, this included four separate groups – baronet, knight, esquire, and gentleman. In 1611, the fifth division – the Order of Baronets – was included by James I in order to raise money for the upkeep of military forces in Ireland. While baronets were not members of the aristocracy, they were holders of a hereditary title of honour, which was passed on through the male line. Knighthoods – which ranked below a baronetcy – were purely honorific orders established to confer prestige and distinction. ‘Esquire’ was originally a title relating to the battlefield and those aspiring to knighthood, or an attendant to a knight. ‘Gentleman’ was used generally for a man of high rank, good social standing and wealth. The usage of both esquire and gentleman became even more fluid over time.
This was a highly desirable status as there was particular prestige attached to those who inherited landed estates over a number of generations. Of these subscriptions to Barber’s volume, twenty-eight are styled baronets and eight ‘Sir’, representing those with knighthoods. The remaining 201 gentry are styled ‘Esq.’ representing the ‘squirearchy’ of England and Ireland.

The clergy formed another conspicuous group on Barber’s list. Their presence suggested a certain moral approval and lent respectability to a married woman writing for money. In total, there were fifty-seven clerical subscriptions, representing 6% of Barber’s list. This included one archbishop, seven bishops, two archdeacons, three deans and forty-four reverends. Most of these subscriptions were gathered through Swift and Delany’s support. Barber also received support from those holding senior state offices and representing the professions. The list records one Master of the Rolls, four Barons of the Exchequer, one Serjeant-at-law, one Attorney General of Ireland, one Judge of the Prerogative Court of York, seven aldermen, one Speaker to the House of Commons and three governors. The military services are represented by twenty subscriptions, including one brigadier, one major general, eleven colonels, five captains and two sergeants. Other professions listed include eleven medical doctors, one attorney and one barrister of the Inner Temple. In addition, eight subscribers are listed as holding a university degree (excluding clergy). These include three Doctors, one Doctor of Law, two Masters of Arts, and two Bachelors of Arts. Of the remaining 313 subscribers, 112 are styled ‘Mr’, 188 ‘Mrs’, and thirteen ‘Miss’. Three of the subscriptions identify the occupation as ‘Merchant’. (Although not noted on the subscription list, we can identify three other prominent Dublin names: bankers, Arthur Hill and Thomas Putland and customs and excise collector, Luke Gardiner (see chapter 4 for further discussion of these subscribers).
Unsurprisingly, the literary sphere is also represented on Barber’s list. Apart from subscriptions from Swift and Delany, there are six other writers on Barber’s list, including the Scriblerians Alexander Pope and John Gay; the poet and playwright, Ambrose Philips; the poet and devotional writer Elizabeth Singer Rowe, and ‘Bath’ poets, William Ward and Mary Chandler. Famous other Bath subscribers include socialites Beau Nash and Suzanna Watts. There are also subscriptions from Barber’s printer and publisher, Samuel Richardson and Charles Rivington; and four other Dublin printers: William Faulkner, Swift’s printer; George Grierson, King’s Printer in Dublin and widower of her old friend, Thomas Bacon and Richard Malone. The portrait painter, James Worsdale, who would later be implicated in the scandal surrounding Laetitia Pilkington, also subscribed. Other names of interest include: ‘Mrs Pendarvis’ (Mary Pendarves, later Mrs Delany) and Anne Donnellan, who had come to Dublin in 1731; watercolourist and miniature painter, Letitia Bushe; Frances-Arabella Kelly, the society beauty and favourite of Swift (for a full discussion of these subscribers see Chapter 4).

Comparing Barber’s subscription list to those of her contemporaries

According to figures produced by P.J. Wallis, 686 lists prior to 1801 yield a median of 245 subscribers. This suggests that Barber’s total of 918 subscribers was particularly successful.\textsuperscript{53} Her achievement is especially striking when compared to the subscription lists of some of her contemporaries. Mary Masters’s Poems on Several Occasions (1733) lists a healthy 721 subscribers; however, only forty of these came from nobles, persons with courtesy titles, or baronets. The large majority came from Masters’s home town of

\textsuperscript{53} In their study of 686 subscription lists, Wallis and Wallis show that the majority of subscription lists (198) had between 101 and 200 subscribers, while just forty-six subscription lists had over 800 subscriptions. See P.J. Wallis and R. Wallis, Extended Supplement to the Revised Guide, 3.
Norwich.\textsuperscript{54} Jean Adam’s \textit{Miscellany Poems} (Glasgow, 1734) registered a modest 153 names. Adam’s subscription was respectable in the context of Wallis’s median; however, it highlights Barber’s superior achievement. The majority of Adam’s subscribers were collected between the local towns of Greenock, Craufordsdyke, and Cartsburn, with some from the larger cities of Edinburgh and Glasgow. Customs officers figure most numerously among the subscribers: others include the Laird of Cartsburn, Thomas Crauford (to whom the book is dedicated), and assorted artisans, including wig makers and a coppersmith.\textsuperscript{55} The ‘local’ representation on Adam’s list reflects a strong regional bias typical of most subscription lists, whereas Barber’s subscription reflects support from both England and Ireland. Barber’s active engagement in the mapping of her subscription list was an attempt to maximise profits and build a social reputation. The example of Barber was analogous to the practices of Charlotte Lennox and Sarah Fielding, both of whom came to London during the 1740s, making it their base, from which they launched their subscription publications. Lennox appears never to have left the city for any significant period, while Fielding moved to Bath in 1753. For Lennox, the city was the only viable locus for the pursuit of her trade. The network of contacts she established there was close-knit and depended on urban proximity. Fielding, on the other hand, relinquished these assets, leaving behind her printer and friend, Samuel Richardson. But, her move to Bath proved positive. She maintained the sort of social connections that not only helped cultivate London business links, but also helped her insert herself into local support networks.\textsuperscript{56} Basing herself in Bath, known for its relatively permeable boundary between gentry and middling classes, seems to have permitted Fielding to practise her authorship and maintain support. In 1730, Barber travelled between London,

\textsuperscript{54} In total, there are forty subscriptions from nobles, persons with courtesy titles, and baronets on Masters’s subscription list.
\textsuperscript{55} Overton, ‘The Subscription List for Jean Adam’, 392-95.
\textsuperscript{56} For a full discussion of the literary careers of Sarah Fielding and Charlotte Lennox, see Betty A. Schellenberg, \textit{The Professionalization of Women Writers in Eighteenth-Century Britain} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 94-119.
Tunbridge Wells and Bath, using all three places to her advantage. This active engagement in
the mapping of her subscription list accounts for its strength and shows that women were not
as limited as we might have previously assumed.

Barber’s subscription list also compares favourably with those of her male
contemporaries. Her list records nearly twice as many subscriptions as the first edition of
Stephen Duck’s collected poems, his only subscription volume. The London 1736 imprint of
his *Poems on Several Subjects* claims 598 sponsors. As Budd has noted, Duck’s enjoyment of
royal patronage would have interested Barber. She was implicated in a public scandal during
the summer of 1731, that included three letters to Queen Caroline, proclaiming her ‘the best
female poet of this or perhaps any age ... whose genius is either honoured or envied by every
man of genius in England’ under which appeared Swift’s forged signature (see Chapter 4).57
Duck’s quarto might have been expected to supersede Barber’s in popularity among readers
— if only because of the proven appeal of Duck’s verse in the marketplace. By 1736, his
prestigiously titled *Poems on Several Subjects, which were publicly read ... in the drawing-
room at Windsor Castle, on Friday, the 11th of September, 1730*, had already gone through
more than ten editions (of which seven were pirated), and poems would continue to appear
under his name in editions and miscellanies throughout the eighteenth century.58

Barber’s volume also garnered more subscriptions than George Faulkner’s first Irish
edition of Swift’s *Collected Works*, which claimed 887 subscribers in Dublin in 1735. In
addition, her subscriptions exceeded Faulkner’s Irish edition of Pope’s *Works*, which listed
233 subscribers in Dublin in 1736. Of course, Swift and Pope were not dependent on
patronage nor subscription. Swift, in particular, preferred to think of himself, not only as

58 For further discussion of Stephen Duck’s subscription list see Budd, ‘Merit in Distress’, 207.
independent, but ‘above’ any form of patronage. Writing to Benjamin Motte on 9 December 1732, he declared: ‘I have cause to believe that some of our printers will collect all they think to be mine, and print them by subscription, which I will neither encourage [n]or oppose.’\footnote{Swift also refused payment for Tory pamphlets between 1710-14. See ‘Jonathan Swift: Political Tracts, 1711-1713’, in \textit{The Prose Writings of Jonathan Swift}, ed. Herbert Davis, 14 vols (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1973), 6: viii-xxviii; Ian Campbell Ross, ‘The Scriblerians and Swift in Ireland’, in \textit{Reading Swift: Papers from the Second Münster Symposium on Jonathan Swift}, ed. Richard H. Rodino, Hermann J. Real, Helgard Stöver-Leidig (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1993), 82-90; ‘The Legal Response to Swift’s \textit{The Public Spirit of the Whigs}’, in \textit{Swift and his Contexts}, ed. John Irwin Fischer, Hermann J. Real, and James Woolley (New York: AMS Press, 1989), 20-38.} Still, it is impressive that Barber’s single volume of poems surpassed both of theirs, especially given that most of the subscribers to Barber’s volume were procured through the persistent efforts of Swift in Dublin and Pope in London (see Chapter 4). It was perhaps most personally satisfying for Barber, that her subscription list outshone that of fellow Dublin poet, and rival, Matthew Pilkington, whose list records a mere 247 sponsors. Pilkington’s \textit{Poems}, dedicated to the Earl of Kildare, recorded just thirty-eight subscriptions from peers — the majority came from local subscribers in Dublin.

\textit{Multiple subscriptions to Barber’s Poems}

The vast majority of people would subscribe for a single copy, but when persons subscribed for more than this, the number subscribed for was provided along with their names. On the one hand, to subscribe for several copies of a volume is an opportunity for the subscriber to publicly display his/her wealth; on the other, it also conveys the patron’s particularly enthusiastic support of the author. In financial terms, multiple subscriptions would have projected an attractive potential profit before printing began.

Barber must have been greatly encouraged by the total of sixty-four sponsors who were (in theory, at least) willing to commit to multiple copies of her \textit{Poems} (see Appendix 2).

\footnote{Swift, \textit{Corr.} 3: 564.}
Thirty-six (56%) of these multiple subscriptions were made by men, and twenty-eight (44%) were made by women. Of these sixty-four multiple subscriptions, twenty (31%) signed for five copies or more. Twenty-five multiple subscriptions (39%) were made by peers and eight (12%) by the clergy. Hugh Reid has noted how subscribers who were reputable patrons of the arts might have the added benefit of encouraging a form of competition among other subscribers.⁶¹ In Barber’s case, the multiple subscriptions of two celebrated female patrons – the Countess of Hertford (two copies) and the Duchess of Newcastle (seven copies) – would have been likely to promote further support in England.

Unsurprisingly, Barber’s patrons in Dublin — Lord Carteret, Swift and Delany — subscribed for multiple copies. It appears that Swift and Delany (who signed for ten copies each) are most likely responsible for encouraging further multiple subscriptions in Ireland and England. The Earls of Oxford and Arran, Lady Elizabeth Germain, Mrs Acheson, and John Barber, Alderman of London, were all friends and correspondents of Swift during Barber’s period of amassing subscriptions. Dr. Richard Helsham, Rev. Samuel Madden and Mrs. Clayton (wife of Robert Clayton, Bishop of Killala) were part of Delany and Swift’s *inner sanctum* at Delville. Mrs. Tennison, Delany’s first wife, whom he married in 1732, subscribed for a generous ten copies. Other multiple subscriptions included those of Sir Thomas and Lady Hanmer, and Dr. Richard Mead and his wife, who were friends of Pope in London. Barber also proved more successful than her contemporaries in collecting multiple subscriptions to her volume. Matthew Pilkington acquired just seven multiple subscriptions for his *Poems on Several Occasions* (Dublin, 1730). Mary Masters’s *Poems* collected a more substantial forty-nine. Jean Adam’s *Miscellany Poems* records just four multiple copies, while Stephen Duck’s *Poems* garnered a mere eight subscriptions for more than one copy.

In his discussion of subscription lists, Pat Rogers has written how ‘few facts in

---

literary discussion are so unambiguously facts as the names of subscribers’. As we have seen, the subscription list is a fruitful source that promises the modern scholar information of a kind not found in the text itself. It reveals owners, potential readers, and reflects a segment of the book-buying market. The combination of titled, literary, religious, professional and cultural signatories – many of whom subscribed for multiple copies — demonstrates that she was well-promoted within elite circles. Barber’s long subscription list also surpassed her male and female contemporaries, and illustrates that, on paper at least, she knew all the best people: those with money, position and power. Statistical analysis has been the first step in understanding how those names may have been read in Barber’s time. As Lockwood observes: ‘there is something irresistible about all those names at the front of the volume ... In an age so given to keeping the real personal names out of its books except in the most controlled or approved form, it is a shock to see so many real names printed on the page of a work of polite letters.’ To understand how Barber achieved this support demands a further investigation of how she gathered these subscriptions, who supported and facilitated her, and what sort of relationship she had with individual subscribers. The following chapter identifies her subscribers in order to analyse her relationship to these sponsors and evaluate Barber’s subscription.

---
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Chapter 4: Subscribers: Barber’s subscription process in England and Ireland, 1730-1732

It took Barber three years to complete the subscription to her Poems. In that time, she had gathered names from most ‘many truly good and great’ of the day, including aristocrats such as Lady Elizabeth Germain and the Earl of Oxford; literary figures, such as Elizabeth Rowe, Alexander Pope and John Gay, and political figures including Sir Robert Walpole. Barber wrote sixty verse dedications to her subscribers, and managed to support both herself and her family during the process. If Barber’s subscription list highlights her success in gathering support, her subscription process shows the complex, involved and difficult road she travelled. Such an undertaking inevitably brought with it the impossibility of keeping everyone satisfied. Barber encountered criticism from those who thought her verse inferior, from those impatient to read their names in print, and others who thought a woman should not write at all. At other critical moments she would learn that subscription-hunting was a task which must be approached with tact and perseverance — even among close friends. Perhaps the most distressing of all was her implication in the forgery of a letter to Queen Caroline in 1731, the result of which potentially severed her relations to her aristocratic subscribers and her patron, Swift.

Thus far there has been no comprehensive study of Barber’s subscription process. Adam Budd’s reading of her subscription presents the financial implications of her endeavour as a means to explain her ‘troubled success’ and eventual obscurity as a writer.1 However, a preoccupation with Barber’s financial gains, which cannot be conclusively verified, cloaks other equally important considerations such as: How did she accomplish gathering so many subscribers from a cross-section of polite society? Who assisted her in her subscription? What sort of relationship, if any, did Barber have to these subscribers? To what extent did

---

1 Adam Budd, ‘Merit in Distress’: The Troubled Success of Mary Barber’ The Review of English Studies, 53. 210 (2002): 204. In this article, Budd focuses wholly on Barber’s method of attracting subscribers as the reason behind her ‘subsequent financial collapse and long-standing obscurity’.
subscription-hunting affect her poetry? To describe the nature of Barber’s subscription accurately, we need to examine much more carefully the context of her subscription, and to analyze in detail the identity of the subscribing public.

This chapter, for the first time, provides answers to such questions through a narrative history of the circumstances in which Barber’s subscriptions were gathered. The chapter is chronologically divided into three sections to correspond with Barber’s subscription in England and Ireland. The first concentrates upon Barber’s subscription-hunting at Tunbridge Wells and Bath between 1730 and 1732, and in particular, her verse dedications to subscribers. Placing these poems in their proper context allows for a fresh understanding of the function of this type of verse. The second shifts the focus onto Barber’s subscription gathering in London in 1731 and 1732, and specifically, Swift’s efforts to marshal support on her behalf. This section examines Swift’s influence with aristocratic subscribers, as well as his literary friends. Analysing Swift’s influence exposes the important agency women had in every facet of Barber’s subscription. His choice of four women, Mrs. Britton, Mary Caesar, Catherine and Charlotte Hyde, who would drum up support and organise the details of Barber’s subscription further demonstrates the important role women had in supporting subscriptions. However, this chapter also reveals that despite the backing of Swift and women agents in London, subscription-hunting was a no easy task. Swift’s correspondence with Lady Germain, for example, reveals the ever-present difficulty of delays in communication, while Barber’s solicitation of an increasingly irritated Alexander Pope, also demonstrates how subscription-seeking required delicacy and tact. In the final part of section 2, her implication in the forgery of letters to Queen Caroline in 1731 further raises the important consideration of how women writers could project their work publicly without risking their reputations.

In the light of Swift’s involvement, I will also interpret the significance of the
presence of subscribers of the Whig and Tory parties on Barber’s list. The final section examines the consolidation of Barber’s subscription in Dublin, in which I demonstrate that while Dublin was the starting point of Barber’s literary endeavours, and a fruitful source of support, Barber expended little energy collecting subscribers there. Instead, she was preoccupied with preparations to return to London to print her Poems, which is reflected both in her poetry and her approach to Alderman Barber in London. Throughout, I will consider the means used, the persons employed and the aims expressed, with a view to assessing Barber’s subscription ‘success’.

Barber’s subscription in Tunbridge Wells and Bath

Barber left Dublin for Tunbridge Wells, Kent, to begin soliciting subscriptions in the summer of 1730. She also visited Bath, but her subscription began at Tunbridge Wells and was largely concentrated there during her first three summers in England. Royal Tunbridge Wells, simply referred to as ‘The Wells’, was one of the four major spa centres of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century England which owed their development to the discovery

---

2 Four poems printed in Barber’s Poems locate her in Tunbridge Wells from July 1730 until October 1730: ‘On the Dutchess of Newcastle’s Picture Written at Tunbridge-Wells, July, 1730’; ‘To her Grace the Dutchess of Manchester and Lady Diana Spencer, now Dutchess [sic] of Bedford. The humble Petition of Jemmy Pen, at Tunbridge Wells, August, 1730’; ‘A Letter written from London to Mrs Strangeways-Horner, whom the Author had left the day before at Tunbridge Wells, October, 1730’. Another verse, ‘Written at Tunbridge-Wells, where the Author had, the Year before, been honour’d with the Acquaintance of Mrs. Strangeways Horner, who after went abroad on Account of her Health’ places Barber at the Wells sometime in 1731. Barber, Poems, 77, 120, 149, 215. A letter from Mrs. Russell to Mrs. Charlotte Clayton (Lady Sundon) pinpoints Barber at Bath on 18 October 1731: ‘Mrs. Barber is just come. I saw her last night.’ Memoirs of the Viscountess Sundon: Mistress to the Robes of Queen Caroline, Consort of George II, ed. A. T. Thompson, 2 vols. (London: H. Colburn, 1848), 1: 68.

3 In August 1731, Barber received a poem at Tunbridge Wells from her son, Constantine: ‘A Letter to Mrs. Barber at Tunbridge Wells, August 28, 1731’, which suggests that she spent at least part of her second summer in England at Tunbridge Wells. Barber, Poems, 246. It is possible that she spent part of the summer of 1732 at both Wells and Bath before returning to Dublin in September 1732.
of curative spring waters during the Tudor and early Stuart periods. Situated on the sandstone High Weald, the wells at Tunbridge produce chalybeate springs, or mineral waters containing iron salts — properties believed to assist in the recovery of health during the period. The Tunbridge springs first attracted the attention of Dudley, Lord North, in 1606. His physician claimed the waters could cure ‘the colic, the melancholy, and the vapours; it made the lean fat, the fat lean; it killed flat worms in the belly, loosened the clammy humours of the body, and dried the over-moist brain.’ Barber’s prefatory comments to her Poems noted how it was her ‘Want of Health, which I had reason to think was occasion’d by a sedentary Life’ — or gout — that had motivated her visit to The Wells in 1730.

Tunbridge Wells was the resort of choice for Barber, a woman of delicate health who might be interested in the waters, but whose primary concern was making the acquaintance of leisured patrons. Throughout the eighteenth century it became the fashion for society’s elite to repair to both resorts to meet and greet. Royal visitors such as Queen Henrietta Maria in 1630; Queen Catherine in 1663; Charles II in 1665; Prince James (later James II) and his daughter Princess (later Queen) Anne did much to encourage its development and infrastructure.

Charles Paulet, third Duke of Bolton (1685–1754), lived at Tunbridge; the Duke of Dorset, Lady Germain, the Duchess of Marlborough and Lady Carteret were among

---

4 Harrogate was the first resort to earn itself the title of the ‘first English Spaw [sic]’ in 1571, followed by Tunbridge in 1606 and Epsom in 1618. For more on early English spa culture, see Thomas Benge Burr, The History of Tunbridge-Wells (London, 1766); A.B. Granville, Spas of England and Principal Sea-Bathing Places: the Midlands and the South (London, 1841, repr. 1971); Lewis Melville, Society at Tunbridge Wells in the Eighteenth Century and After (London, 1912).

5 Quoted in Melville, Society at Tunbridge Wells, 22.

6 Barber, Poems, xxii.

7 When Defoe visited Tunbridge Wells in the early 1720s he observed: ‘The ladies that appear here, are indeed the glory of the place; the coming to the Wells to drink the water is a mere matter of custom ... company and diversion is in short the main business of the place.’ Another anonymous author who contributed to the 1714 Tunbridge and Bath Miscellanies, composed a fictional letter between two friendly male correspondents, reported a visit to the spa town, undertaken not for the improvement of his health, but for entertainment: ‘the reasons that induc’d me to ... Tunbridge, were neither the air nor the waters, but purely the curiosity of seeing the people and the place,’ for, as he wryly noted, ‘the chief Diversion at the wells is to stare at one another.’ Daniel Defoe, A Tour through the Whole Island of Great Britain (1724–6), ed. Pat Rogers (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971), 141-2.

8 Quoted in Melville, Society at Tunbridge Wells, 55.
those who stayed at Tunbridge during the early 1730s. Repairing to the Wells also assumed a class signature since ‘taking the waters’ was associated with genteel ideals of rustic retreat, leisure and pleasure. By the late seventeenth century the rural backwater was growing into one of the most fashionable spa resorts in England. Besides its numerous houses and inns, Tunbridge possessed two substantial coffee-houses, lotteries and hazard rooms, bowling greens and a large number of chemists’ shops, which were designed to provide a concentrated urban experience of frenetic socializing for society’s elite. The colonnaded walkway known as the Pantiles (see below) became the best-known tourist attraction.

Aerial view of Tunbridge Wells and its famous Pantiles, (1750)

---

12 Thomas Badeslade, ‘Thirty Six Different Views of Noblemen and Gentlemen’s Seats, in the County of Kent’ (London, 1750).
Tunbridge Wells had strong links to its sister spring at Bath. Established by the Romans ca. 60 AD, the ancient city of Bath was one of Europe’s premier spa resorts in the period which stood out for its rapidity of growth, and its impact as a social forum (reflected in a heritage of exemplary Georgian architecture crafted from Bath stone). The city nurtured a huge service economy, including those who provided lodgings, furnished goods, and entertainments. There were theatres, concerts, assemblies, dances, parties, dinners, tea-visits, dice, cards, gambling, promenades, drives and boating. Bath was affectionately satirised in a series of prints *The Comforts of Bath* by cartoonist Thomas Rowlandson (see below). Like the Wells, Bath was simultaneously a spa for the sick and a resort for the healthy, but in this period, it was generally considered that no one had really taken the cure — in the social rather than the medical sense — unless they had visited both places.

Thomas Rowlandson, ‘The Pump Room’, *Comforts of Bath* (1798)

Resorts such as the Wells and Bath were organised as meeting-places, public forums for communal resort. Social integration at spring resorts like Tunbridge Wells enabled conversation across social strata that might have been unlikely in London. By 1766, it was reported at Tunbridge, that ‘all ranks are mingled together without any distinction. The nobility and the merchants, the gentry and the traders, are all upon an equal footing, without anybody’s having a right to be informed who you are, or whence you came, so long as you behave with that decorum which is ever necessary in genteel company.’\(^{14}\) Assemblies catered to both genders and, as a result, promoted a different kind of social interchange from that of London — where the élite either remained primarily at home or socialised in public places that were separated by rank.\(^{15}\) The custom at Bath was to frown upon private evening gatherings in favour of attendance at the famous Assemblies. At Tunbridge, Barber successfully solicited aristocrats such as the Dowager Duchess of Marlborough, Lady Barbara North, Lady Sarah Cowper and the Duchess of Newcastle, who were at the Wells in 1730.\(^{16}\) She also appealed successfully to Mrs Southwell, one of the town’s most prominent society hostesses.\(^{17}\) At Bath, Barber solicited subscriptions from the poet, William Ward; the Bath milliner and poet, Mary Chandler; the enterprising Susannah Watts, who would later enact a scheme to organise a theatre there in defiance of the Act for the Suppression of Play-Houses; and Richard (Beau) Nash (1674–1761), who played a leading role in making both Tunbridge and Bath the most fashionable resorts in eighteenth-century England.\(^{18}\)

Literary figures were also drawn to the cultivated social scene at these resorts. Daniel

---

\(^{14}\) Quoted in Benge Burr, *History of Tunbridge Wells*, 121.

\(^{15}\) Assembly rooms catered to a large number of guests who would meet, dance, play cards, listen to music, or simply sip tea and socialize for a nominal subscription fee. Paul Langford has explained that the activities of assemblies were less important than the forum which they created for social and sexual mixing. Coffee-houses, taverns, and inns were unsuitable for polite female company, whereas assemblies could be strictly regulated to size and social conduct. See Paul Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People: England 1727-1783* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 101-102. Barbara Benedict has observed how these spring resorts ‘offered an inclusive revelry, a place and time for throwing off prescribed identity.’ *Consumptive Communities*, 204.

\(^{16}\) These poems are dated during the summer of 1730 when Barber first arrived at Tunbridge.

\(^{17}\) Melville, *Society in Tunbridge Wells*, 172.

Defoe visited both Wells and Bath during the early 1720s; Scriblerians John Gay and Arbuthnot were at the Wells in 1731. Both Bath and Wells were also important centres of intellectual resort for women writers. Tunbridge Wells attracted Elizabeth Montagu, her cousin Gilbert West and others of the group later distinguished as the Bluestockings. Anne Finch, Sarah Scott, Lady Barbara Montagu, Sarah Fielding, Catherine Macaulay, Mary Chandler and Sophia Lee were all at Bath.

The most pivotal connection Barber made during her first visit to Tunbridge Wells was with John Boyle, the fifth Earl of Orrery. She would later dedicate her *Poems* to the earl, but at this time he presented a number of important literary connections. In her Preface, Barber describes their first meeting, which arose from her assisting an English gentlewoman, who was ‘reduced to unhappy Circumstances, by unavoidable Misfortunes, which occasion’d her to request of me (when I was going for England) to get a Pair of Diamond Ear-rings disposed of for her, which she thought might be done to some little Advantage if they were raffled for.’ Such lotteries were popular at spa resorts, and Barber ‘was generously assisted in that Endeavour’ by (Swift’s Scriblerian friend) Dr. Arbuthnot. Arbuthnot, a physician to Queen Caroline, was at the Wells in 1728, and again, in 1731. His letter to Mrs. Howard (Countess of Suffolk) reported on the Queen’s improvement there: ‘Her Highness charms everybody by her affable and courteous behaviour, of which I am not only a witness, but have the honour to be a partaker.’ It is likely that Dr. Arbuthnot helped to advertise the raffle among aristocratic circles. The earrings were ‘raffled for at Tunbridge-Wells, and won by the

---

21 I refer to John Boyle, fifth Earl of Orrery, as ‘Orrery’ throughout. See Chapter 5 for a full discussion of the dedication of Barber’s *Poems* to Orrery.
Lord Boyle (now Earl of Orrery). It is likely that Orrery had the jewels in mind as a present for his wife, Lady Henrietta Hamilton — whom he had married just two years previously. However, as Barber recalls, instead of keeping the earrings, Orrery ‘inquir’d for the Person commission’d to dispose of the jewels, and in a most generous manner (although he had then a Family, and was not possess’d of his Estate) desir’d I would restore them to her again. This serendipitous meeting introduced Barber to Orrery; she observes how ‘the little Trouble I had upon that Occasion, hath prov’d a great Blessing to me, as it first gained me the Honour and Happiness of being known to his Lordship, now my great Patron and Benefactor. In this atmosphere of charity and social benevolence, Barber demonstrates the relative ease with which select circles could be accessed.

Orrery was a central figure in connecting Barber to literary persons at Tunbridge and Bath. He was also friends with Elizabeth Singer Rowe (1674–1737). Rowe’s high reputation for the exemplary piety of her poetry was likely the reason for her subscription to, and inclusion in, Barber’s volume. Known variously as Elizabeth Singer, Elizabeth Rowe, ‘Philomela’, Mrs. Rowe, and Elizabeth Singer Rowe, she was an important figure in the tradition of female poetry. Stuart Curran calls Rowe ‘the presiding moral and aesthetic exemplar for the successful writer of the eighteenth century’, and Norma Clarke has observed Rowe’s ‘abiding legacy and enduring example for those who came after her, especially women.’ Clarke also observes that Rowe inhabits two worlds — the Elizabeth Singer of the 1690s, who celebrated love in all its forms — and the widowed Mrs. Rowe, whose devotional

26 Barber, Poems, xx.
28 Barber, Poems, xxi.
29 Barber, Poems, xxi.
prose was ‘so much to the taste of eighteenth-century readers.’

At the time of Barber’s subscription, Rowe had retired to Frome, in Somersetshire, where she devoted herself to pious exercises, literary work, sketching and correspondence. Orrery, who had a home in nearby Marston, visited Rowe there, and it was likely that he was instrumental in providing the introduction between Barber and Rowe. Rowe’s poem, included by Barber in her *Poems* under the title ‘Verses written by Mrs. Elizabeth Rowe, on her drawing the Lord Boyle’s Picture’, corroborates this assumption. The poem depicts Rowe’s difficulties in sketching an accurate portrait of Orrery: ‘In vain with mimic Skill my Pencil tries / To paint the Life, that sparkles in those Eyes.’ Barber’s inclusion of the poem in her collection points towards the mutual regard both women had for the earl. Another poem by Orrery, ‘Lord Boyle’s Answer to the foregoing Verses’, responds to Rowe’s ‘On the Lord Boyle’s Picture’. In it, he praises Rowe’s skill in poetry: ‘Alike thy Pencil, and thy Numbers charm, / Glad ev’ry Eye, and ev’ry Bosom warm’. Orrery’s poem was also included in Barber’s *Poems*.

It is also likely that Barber’s connection to Orrery and Rowe was instrumental in encouraging the Countess of Hertford’s generous subscription to five copies of her *Poems*. Lady Frances neé Thynne Seymour (1699–1754) was a patron to two generations of poets, including Isaac Watts, James Thompson and Stephen Duck. Rowe also enjoyed Hertford’s patronage; both women shared fervent Christian beliefs and their correspondence spanned more than twenty years. Barber thanked Hertford for her subscription in ‘Occasioned by reading the Memoirs of Anne of Austria, written by Madame de Moteville — Inscribed to the

---

31 Norma Clarke, ‘Soft Passions and Darling Themes’, 353.
33 In 1714, Marston House became the possession of Charles Boyle, fourth Earl of Orrery, who rebuilt the house in 1720.
34 Barber, *Poems*, 265.
35 Barber, *Poems*, 266.
37 For more on Rowe and Hertford’s correspondence see Helen Sard, ‘Elizabeth Rowe and the Countess of Hertford’, *PMLA* 59 (1944):726-746.
Countess of Hertford’ by praising Hertford as, ‘Humane and humble, pious and sincere; / Who walks, untainted, thro’ infectious Air.’\(^{38}\) Barber’s criticism of Machiavellian corruption at Court (‘the maxims of the Florentine’), and the folly of the ‘short-sighted Atheist’ further acknowledged Hertford’s propriety and religious ardour.\(^{39}\)

Other literary connections likely formed through Orrery were with two Bath poets, William Ward (1708–1747) and Mary Chandler (1687–1745).\(^ {40}\) Ward’s ‘To the Reverend Mr. Mabell, of Cambridge, who has published Proposals for a Translation of Longinus’, written at Bath and later anthologised in Barber’s *Poems*, praises Orrery’s benevolence: ‘And such is Orrery, whose gen’rous Mind, / Still prone to pity, feels for human kind.’\(^ {41}\) Another poem by Ward, ‘To the Right Honourable Earl of Orrery in Dublin Upon receiving an account from Mrs. Barber, of his Lordship’s great Generosity to her’, also printed in Barber’s *Poems*, specifically points to Orrery’s benevolent patronage of Mary Barber: ‘Barber you bless, yet hope your Gifts unknown’.

Little is known about William Ward (1708–1747).\(^ {42}\) Bath poet and milliner, Mary Chandler, in her poem ‘To Mrs. Ward’ (1736) claimed that Ward’s extant poetry is dedicated to praising his wife. More significantly in this context, the poem also praised Barber’s poetry:

\[ \text{Sapphira’s Lines with Wit and Humour fraught,} \]
\[ \text{Pure as her Morals, sprightly as her Thought,} \]

---

\(^{38}\) Barber, *Poems*, 73.

\(^{39}\) Barber, *Poems*, 74.

\(^{40}\) According to Budd, Ward, about whom little is currently known, was born in 1708 in Bath and died there in 1747. He married Sarah Chapman of Wedmore (1710-63) on 21 October 1727. His writing was not acknowledged in the *Bath Miscellanies* of 1730 or 1731, nor was he mentioned in the likely collections of contemporary anecdotes (227). Mary Chandler (1687-1745) was Ward’s friend at Bath. Her poem ‘To Mrs. Ward’ praises his wife. In her *A Description of Bath* she records her wish for William Ward’s public recognition: ‘Graceful amidst Sapphira’s work he stands / Pre-eminent, and ev’ry Eye commands; / Who sings with Genius, Elegance and Art, / To warm the Passions, and enlarge the Heart. / Sublime in Sentiment, in Diction pure, / His shall the Critic’s keenest Pen endure; / And stand the Rage of conqu’ring Time secure’ (*A Description of Bath*, 76-7). See Budd, ‘Merit in Distress’, 227.


\(^{42}\) William Ward in Barber, *Poems*, 204.

\(^{43}\) Adam Budd has noted that Ward’s writing was not acknowledged in the *Bath Miscellanies* 1730-31, nor was he mentioned in the likely collections of contemporary anecdotes. Two poems by a ‘Mr Ward’ were printed for the *Gentleman’s Magazine* (1739) ‘To a Lady with some Carnations’, ‘Writ afterwards upon seeing one of them faded in her Bosom’ may also be his. These poems maintain the same material structure and thematic interests of those in Barber’s volume. Adam Budd, ‘Merit in Distress’, 227.
Chandler’s reference to Barber as ‘Sapphira’ in this poem is significant here as it assumes that Barber was known by her epithet in Bath, and more importantly, had achieved a degree of social recognition there.

As discussed in Chapter 2, there was a reciprocal benefit in publishing poems by other hands. This group of discerning, well-disposed friends and supporters in turn boosted Barber’s reputation as a writer and broadened the relationship from simple friendship to include professional collaboration. In her Preface, Barber acknowledged the inclusion of poems by other hands: ‘whether my own Verses shall be approv’d of by my Subscribers or not, it is a Pleasure to me to think that those written by other Hands will always make this Collection of Value.’ Barber’s collection includes six poems by Grierson, five by her own son, Con, three by William Ward, one by Elizabeth Singer Rowe, and one by John Boyle, the fifth Earl of Orrery. Including poems by other poets was an opportunity to self-promote and validate her work. Con’s poetry supported Barber’s claims as a mother writing to instruct her children; her friend, Constantia Grierson had a famed scholarly reputation; the unimpeachable Elizabeth Rowe was patronised and venerated by the aristocracy; Orrery was a peer of the realm, and Ward, it appears, was also much admired by his literary contemporary, Mary Chandler:

Graceful amidst Sapphira’s Works he stands
Pre-eminent, and ev’ry Eye commands;
Who sings with Genius, Elegance, and Art,
To warm the Passions, and enlarge the Heart.
Sublime in Sentiment, in Diction pure
He shall the Critic’s Pen endure,
And stand the Rage of conqu’ring Time secure.

44 Mary Chandler, ‘To Mrs. Ward’, in The Description of Bath. To which are Added Several Poems (London, 1736), 76.
45 Barber, Poems, xviii.
Barber used these poems to suit her own purpose. Verse was the medium in which anyone could document and encourage connections at these places and Barber took full advantage of this method in order to appeal to the personal, intellectual and social taste of the eighteenth-century reader. It is telling that in 1737, when Orrery wrote to Barber with the news that Rowe, had died, he referred to her as Barber’s ‘sister muse’. 47

**How Barber used poetry as a means to procure subscribers at Wells and Bath**

From the moment of her arrival in Tunbridge, Barber began writing poems to prospective subscribers, six of which she submitted to the annual verse miscellany, *Tunbrigialia or Tunbridge Miscellanies, for the Year 1730* (London, 1730). 48 Poems written by, about, and to named individuals of the company gradually became a trend, giving rise to published collections — the ‘spa miscellany’ — which listed the leading belles of the season, and printed ballads, songs and riddles. The *Tunbridge Miscellany*, and later, the *Bath Journal* are two notable examples. 49 It was a sure route to local celebrity, which might spread further as groups dispersed and re-formed the following year. According to Barber’s Preface, it was as a result of these poems that she was urged to print a collection by subscription: ‘Whilst I was then in England, I wrote some few occasional Verses, and was encouraged to print them by several Persons of Quality and Distinction, who generously offer’d to solicit a Subscription for me.’ 50 Whether this was true, or whether this was how Barber wished to explain the motivation behind her subscription in retrospect, there can be no doubt that she wrote her verse for ‘Persons of Quality and Distinction’ at Wells and Bath. Of the 117 poems

---


48 Barber submitted the following six poems for publication in the *Tunbridge Miscellany* (1730): ‘To Dr. Lynch on his Excellent Sermon preach’d at Tunbridge-Wells, ‘An Epigram’; ‘Occasion’d by seeing two Subscribers wanting to fill up a Raffle for Addison’s Works’; ‘To be Written on the Rocks at Tunbridge Wells’; ‘Upon seeing Lady Elizabeth Germain do a generous Action’; and ‘An Apology for the Clergy, who were at Tunbridge Wells’. All of the above poems were later printed in Barber, *Poems*, 77, 120, and 149.


in her collection, fifty-six are dedicated or addressed to individual subscribers and patrons. Most of the dedicated poems are dated between 1730 and the promised date of publication, which was most likely the spring of 1733. This component of her verse shows that she served the interests of the elites of the day, and tended to conform to the traditional patterns of deference. Irvin Ehrenpreis’s comment ‘that a glance at Mrs. Barber’s work reveals that she wrote with more attention to patrons than to her readers’ is largely based on these poems.\(^{51}\)

One of the few extant comments on the critical reception of Barber’s Poems in her own time also indicates that Barber’s poems may not have appealed to everyone’s taste. Writing to Swift, from Bath, Anne Donnellan delicately related that, while Barber’s poems ‘are generally greatly liked there are, indeed, a few severe critics (who think that judgement is only shewn in finding faults) that say they are not poetic; and a few fine ladies, who are not commended in them, that complain they are dull.’\(^{52}\) This is not altogether surprising. Barber was aware of her critics. Her, ‘Account in Verse, How I succeeded in my Subscription’, retorts that such criticism was indicative of aristocratic malice rather than a judicious comment on her work:

```
High-born Belinda loves to blame
On Criticism found her fame:
Whene’er she thinks a Fault she spies,
How Pleasure sparkles in her Eyes!
Call it not Poetry, she says,
No – call it Rhyming if you Please:\(^{53}\)
```

Certainly, penning dedications to individuals such as ‘To the Right Honourable the Lady Dowager Torrington, with some Verses her Ladyship commanded me to send her’ and ‘To Mrs. Armine Cartwright, at Bath’, was always tricky to negotiate. The risk of alienating oneself while obtaining support from another was inevitable. Moreover, with so many poems

\(^{53}\) Barber, *Poems*, 279-80.
printed in verse miscellanies and subscriptions, many people would not have read beyond the index of titles. And it is unlikely that many would have read a poem that was not dedicated to them. The fictionalised ‘critics’ in Barber’s account reveal the self-interest informing their criticism:

    Thus Sylvia, of the haughty Tribe
    She never asked me to subscribe,
    Nor ever wrote a Line on me,
    I was no Theme for Poetry! 54

However, before we dismiss these poems it is necessary to understand the poetic economy in which they were written. What Ehrenpreis’s ‘glance’ and that of many of Barber’s subscribers fails to observe, is Barber’s acute recognition of the mechanics of subscription publication an awareness markedly observed in her decision to open and close her volume with two poems which detail her subscription experience: Constantia Grierson’s ‘To Mrs. Mary Barber, under the name of Saphira: Occasion’d by the Encouragement She met with in England to publish her Poems by Subscription’ and Barber’s ‘Account in Verse, How I succeeded in my Subscription’. The inclusion of these poems creates a self-referential universe that encompasses the poems dedicated to Barber’s subscribers. In order to understand the poems to her subscribers at Tunbridge Wells and Bath, it is important to understand the motivation behind them. Barber’s aim was to penetrate and gather support from polite society. The following three examples show how Barber used successful methods to approach aristocrats for support. The first, written as an ‘Epilogue to a Comedy acted at Bath, where the Dutchess of Ormond was present’, similarly uses a variety of distinctions and superlatives to flatter and praise Ormond’s patronage:

    A lovely Form, and an excelling Mind,
    To all that Providence ordains, resign’d;
    Rever’d by All, Delight of Ev’ry Eye,

54 Barber, Poems, 276-77.
Humane and humble when exalted High
From Princes sprung and gloriously ally’d
At once her Sex’s and her Country’s Pride
Whose Soul, superior to all earthly State,
Shines with new Lustre ’midst the Storms of Fate.\(^{55}\)

The second example, ‘On the Duchess of Newcastle’s Picture’, draws on Barber’s *On The Birth of Manly Virtue*, a poem on Lord Carteret’s portrait (see Chapter 1). In this pen-portrait, Barber demonstrates how portraiture presented an opportunity for the poet to elucidate connections, point to associations, and celebrate family ties. The poem draws together three notable English aristocratic families — Churchill, Godolphin and Pelham — by delineating the family line through Newcastle’s portrait:\(^{56}\)

\[
\text{There we the various Virtues trace} \\
\text{Of Churchill and Godolphin’s Race} \\
\text{Thrice happy Pelham, to whose Arms} \\
\text{Were destin’d never-fading Charms.}\]^{57}

It was a clever strategy in that it appealed to both a taste for portraiture and reading names in print. The final example, Barber’s ‘To her Grace, the Dutchess [sic] of Manchester, and Lady Diana Spencer, now Dutchess [sic] of Bedford, The humble Petition of little Jemmy Pen, at Tunbridge-Wells’ is more curious.\(^{58}\) Barber is known for her petition-writing. However, this poem is different from any of her previous petitions. It is styled as a lover’s plea on behalf of ‘Jemmy Pen’ who laments his distressed predicament now that both the Duchess of Manchester and Lady Spencer have returned to London. The poem is largely concerned with Pen’s attempts to persuade the women to take him with them: ‘Do not, relentless, let me

\(^{55}\) Barber, *Poems*, 118.
\(^{56}\) Lady Henrietta Godolphin who, by birth, was related to the powerful Churchill and Godolphin dynasty and by marriage to Thomas Pelham, first Duke of Newcastle-upon-Tyne. See the entry for her husband, Reed Browning, ‘Holles, Thomas Pelham-, duke of Newcastle upon Tyne and first duke of Newcastle under Lyme (1693–1768),’ Reed Browning in *ODNB*.
\(^{57}\) Barber, *Poems*, 77.
\(^{58}\) Isabella Montagu was wife to William Montagu, second Duke of Manchester, and granddaughter of Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough (1660–1744). Lady Diana Spencer (1710–1735) was daughter of Charles Spencer, Earl of Sunderland and another granddaughter of Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough. In 1731, Lady Spencer married John Russell, fourth Duke of Bedford. This poem was written one year before her marriage to the Duke of Bedford. See James Faulkner, Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough (1660-1744), in *ODNB*, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5405.
moan; / O take me Ladies, as your own!" \(^{59}\) Read another way, it tells us about subscription-seeking at these resorts. Just as these spring resorts were an important source of patronage, this support was often as impermanent and shifting as the springs which run through the town. Pen’s plea to put an end to his ‘relentless’ moaning, shows how often there was much effort expended in getting support with little reward. It is likely that Barber was using the aptly named character, ‘Pen’, to articulate her own position as supplicant. Pen’s petition can be interpreted as divulging Barber’s personal desire to be accepted in elite society.

This type of verse worked well in subscription terms. Aristocrats, to whom poems were dedicated, subscribed to copies of Barber’s collection. The Duchess of Ormond subscribed for two copies. The Duchess of Newcastle, clearly fond of seeing herself in portrait and print, and subscribed to an impressive seven copies. The Duke and Duchess of Manchester, Lady Diana Spencer, and the Duke and Duchess of Bedford subscribed along with other members of their families and friends. \(^{60}\)

Furthermore, poetry was a means to forge connections quickly and decisively in the period. Thus, it is not surprising that most of Barber’s poems to subscribers at Tunbridge and Bath were written not as an expression of inspiration, but to celebrate patrons and to do so with a rapid turnaround. This is clearly evinced in Barber’s extemporaneous verse, such as the following lines from Barber’s poem ‘To the Lady Dowager Torrington with some Verses her Ladyship commanded me to send Her’:


Of Writing I’ll no more repent,  
Nor think my Time unwisely spent,  
If Verse the Happiness procures,  
Of pleasing such a Soul as Yours. \(^{61}\)

---

\(^{59}\) Barber, *Poems*, 120.  
\(^{60}\) Further subscriptions amassed from this aristocratic network include: the Dowager Duchess of Marlborough, the Earl of Sunderland and the Countess of Sunderland. Lady Polwarth, a staunch friend of Duchess of Marlborough, also subscribed to Barber’s *Poems*, as did Viscount Cobham, Lady Frances Pierpoint and Lady Catherine Pierpoint.  
\(^{61}\) Barber, *Poems*, 33.
Sarah Churchill, Dowager Duchess of Marlborough
Harriet Pelham-Holles, Duchess of Newcastle
Lady Diana Spencer (on the left)
Lady Barbara North
Another example is Barber’s brief four-line stanza ‘To the Right Honourable the Lady Elizabeth Brownlow, upon desiring me to send Her some of my Poems’:

Who can the hardest Task refuse,
When lovely Lady Betty sues?
If her Requests Resistance find,
It must be from the Deaf and Blind.  62

On the one hand the ‘stand and deliver’ style of this type of verse leaves Barber wide open to charges of ‘rhyming’, sycophancy and partisan support. On the other, this verse also displays a particular skill in approaching her audience. Paula Backscheider’s recent anthology of eighteenth-century women’s poetry illustrates how the vogue of dashing off poetry to comply with a friend’s request to celebrate a private occasion or to display the ability to write polished, extemporaneous verse was an important part of social etiquette and refinement.  63

This method of writing was not unique to Barber. Twenty years earlier, Anne Finch’s ‘To a Lady having desired me to compose something upon the foregoing Subject’ (1711), demonstrates how poems were part of the cultural expectations of this social and often competitive poetic production. Thus, these spontaneous poems combine both impressive metrical ease, with adherence to social mores. The Lady Dowager Torrington subscribed to three copies; Lady Elizabeth Brownlow to another two copies. That Barber’s poems demonstrate a light touch, should not be confused with a lack of skill. On the contrary, they stand as an example of polite discourse in the period, and, more importantly, proved a successful method of making subscription connections for Barber.

While Barber might have used verse as an opportunity of playing toady to potential subscribers, other poems written at Wells and Bath show that the poet was no mere backscratcher — a fact often obscured by the focus on her preoccupation with obtaining support. Among the poems that Barber submitted to the Tunbridge Miscellany are three in

62 Barber, Poems, 41.
particular, in which she makes clear that she deplored the frivolity of fashionable life at these spring resorts. In ‘Upon seeing a Raffle for Addison’s works unfill’d’, Barber lambasts the ‘gentle Beaux’ and ‘thoughtless Belles’ for accumulating material rather than mental riches when a lottery for Addison’s *Works* failed because visitors were wandering about ‘With Pockets full and empty Looks, / Raffling for every Toy – but Books.’64 Barber ran the risk of being read as a self-serving and pompous moraliser by prospective subscribers, particularly the last line which reads: ‘Be wise Subscribe and show at least, / That you have one Pretence to Taste.’65 The poem demonstrates that while these resorts offered opportunities for gathering support, they were also the source of flagrant consumerism in which trinkets and souvenirs competed with books for the customer’s attention. It also reveals that Barber was faced with a younger demographic which had money to spend, but was not interested in books alone. With so many literary hopefuls seeking support, how does one manage to stand out in the crowd? If persons were uninterested in subscribing to the ‘great’ Addison, how much more difficult would it be for her — an unknown, woollen-draper’s wife — to request money for her poems?

Doubtless, Barber’s desire to project herself as a virtuous poet had something to do with her self-consciousness about her Irish origins. Barber would have seen herself as English in the way that Roy Porter has demonstrated, many Irish saw themselves as English: ‘Englishness in this sense was similar to the way Britishness later came to be used to describe a common national bond, in which an ethnic Irish identity remained intact.’66 However, C.A. Bailey’s recent study of Irish migrants to England in the eighteenth century has demonstrated how the manners and financial solvency of many Irish came under scrutiny by English

64 Barber, *Poems*, 46.
counterparts suspicious of Irish provincialism.\textsuperscript{67} In the words of Barber’s contemporary Mary Davys, ‘To Tell the Reader I was born in Ireland, is to bespeak of a general Dislike to all I write’.\textsuperscript{68} Barber was conscious of her origins. She referred to herself as a ‘Stranger’ both in her poems and in her Preface. One of her first experiences of the Wells, ‘Written upon the Rocks at Tunbridge, on seeing the Names of several Persons there’ reveals a tension between Barber’s Irish identity and her aspiration to live her life in England. This strain is manifested through a stark contrast between Barber as an impoverished, troubled, Irish poet and the wealthy, pleasure-seeking English:

\begin{quote}
Hither the Britons, void of Care,
A happy, free-born Race, repair:
Whilst I, who feel a different Fate,
Lament my Country’s wretched State.\textsuperscript{69}
\end{quote}

It was not just the profligate young women and men whom Barber criticised at these resorts. Surprisingly, the Tunbridge-Wells clergy were not immune from Barber’s censure. In the ironically titled, ‘An Apology for the Clergy, who were at Tunbridge-Wells when the Minister read Prayers, and preach’d twice in one Day’, Barber exposes the indifference at the Wells, where both the ecclesiastical and the lay community are, according to Barber, equally bereft of both spiritual and social conscience. On the one hand, the parishioners, who are oblivious to the spiritual authority of the clergy, ‘love to gibe, / And throw their Jests on Levi’s Tribe.’\textsuperscript{70} On the other, apathetic clergymen, unperturbed by their parishioners’ derision, sit ‘yawning by’.\textsuperscript{71} The poem highlights a lack of moral direction. The clergymen are not working, yet they have an audience, whereas Barber has to work hard to procure her audience. Her criticism of the clergy in ‘Epigram on the Same Occasion’ was even more

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{67} Bailey writes how ‘The poverty of high-status Irish in comparison with their English counterparts, the provincial pride of some and the willingness to gamble, drink, take risks, and deceive (to overcome such disabilities) produced a great deal of anxiety about Irishness in fashionable circles.’ C.A. Bailey, ‘The Irish Network: a Study of Ethnic Patronage in London, 1760-1840’, (PhD thesis, King’s College London, 2004), 20.
\textsuperscript{69} Barber, Poems, 147-8.
\textsuperscript{70} Barber, Poems, 144-45.
\textsuperscript{71} Barber, Poems, 144-45.
\end{footnotes}
incisive: ‘Why should they deign to preach, or pray, Barber asks, ‘For any View, — but present Pay?’ Money was also the theme in, ‘To the Reverend Dr. L — Occasion’d by his Sermon for the Support of the Charity-Children at Tunbridge-Wells, where the Collection was small’. The clergy are immune to poverty and distress. Barber transforms the chemical properties of the waters into a social criticism of the clergy: ‘dire Effects the Wretched feel’, when ‘Thy Waters turn the Heart to Steel.’ Given Barber’s outspoken criticism of English clerics it is little wonder that so few clergymen at Wells and Bath subscribed to her Poems.

Yet, there is also evidence that Barber’s flattering verse succeeded, not just in acquiring subscriptions, but in penetrating polite society at the Wells. In ‘Written at Tunbridge Wells, To the Right Honourable Lady Barbara North, occasion’d by some of the Company’s saying they would go to Faint-Fair, and act a Play’, Barber recounts her experience as part of a troop of genteel dilettantes enacting a muddled version of a Greek fable at the Wells. The poem gestures towards the camaraderie between the women, but more importantly, Barber highlights her inclusion in the action: ‘In some few Hours we must repair / To act, like Thespis, in the Fair.’ The word ‘we’ clearly shows that Barber was included as part of this group. This was a significant achievement for an Irish poet who started with few connections in Wells or Bath.

This fact runs contrary to Adam Budd’s assertion that Barber had a peripheral status at Wells and Bath among many of the influential figures of the period, and that ‘any interest on their part was merely a passing gesture of charity at best.’ Certainly there were challenges to accessing polite circles. Scottish author Tobias Smollett, who likely understood the difficulties of being an outsider, wrote in Ferdinand Count Fathom (1753):

---

72 Barber, Poems, 145.
73 Barber, Poems, 141.
74 ‘Faint-Fair’ is footnoted in Barber’s Poems as being ‘Near Tunbridge-Wells’. Barber was likely referring to Frant — a village five miles south of Tunbridge, on the Kentish border.
75 Barber, Poems, 45.
76 Budd, ‘Merit in Distress’, 217-18.
A maxim universally prevails among the English people, namely, to overlook and wholly neglect, on their return to the metropolis, all the connections they have chanced to acquire during their residence at any of the medicinal wells, and this distinction is so scrupulously maintained, that the two persons who lived in the most intimate acquaintance at Bath and Tunbridge shall, in four-and-twenty hours, so totally forget their friendship as to meet in St. James’s Park without betraying the least token of recognition; so that one would imagine those mineral waters were so many streams issuing from the river Lethe.\(^{77}\)

However, as Barber’s verse demonstrates, she had more than a peripheral status at these resorts. Her verse also shows that she was in conversation with elite company long enough to be given a token of friendship. In ‘To the Right Honourable the Lady Barbara North, on her presenting the Author with a white Ribband, at Tunbridge Wells’, is an example of this exchange: ‘This Present from a lovely Dame, / Fair and unsully’d as her Fame’.\(^{78}\) Two aspects are important. Firstly, the ribbon is important as symbol. Amanda Vickery has also noted how sentimental gifts signalled an engagement with fashionable consumerism, whereas small presents confirm friendship.\(^{79}\) Ribbons, bows, and rosettes were fashionable accessories to eighteenth-century dress and it was popular to wear a cockade (knot of ribbons) on hats or hair. Ribbon was a visible symbol, which could be worn, talked about and written about. Secondly, for those who knew Lady North, the gift took on a further significance. Lady North was an important figure at Tunbridge Wells — the north family had connections with the Wells since her husband’s grandfather, Dudley, Lord North had been attracted to the springs in 1606.\(^{80}\) For Barber, the ribbon, which she was able to both wear and write about, was an important signifier. The colour of the ribbon is also noteworthy given that in the eighteenth century, the white cockade (or ribbon) was regularly worn by those supporting the restoration


\(^{78}\) Barber, *Poems*, 227.

\(^{79}\) Amanda Vickery notes how ‘the exchange of compliments, gifts, visits and meals sustained the horizontal ties of friendship. Vertical relationships within the community were fostered through gracious hospitality dispensed on designated days.’ Vickery, *The Gentleman’s Daughter*, 209.

\(^{80}\) For a history of the North family at Tunbridge Wells, see Melville, *Society at Tunbridge Wells*, 22.
of a Jacobite monarchy.\textsuperscript{81} It is perhaps no coincidence that Barber writes how this particular token ‘Shall be to Hibernia conveyed’.\textsuperscript{82}

Barber’s subscription at Tunbridge Wells and Bath was successful. For three summers Barber maintained herself at these expensive resorts and made connections sufficient to her purpose. Despite claims from critics, her poetry provided her with the means to live a life outside the confines of the drapery and enabled her to imagine and put in place a better life for her children. The endorsement of the ‘Irish Poetess’ points to her successful penetration of that sphere and undoubtedly gave her the confidence to solicit further subscriptions in London.

\textit{Barber’s subscription in London}

When the season at Tunbridge Wells had ended, Barber shifted her attention towards London. Jerry White’s recent account of the city demonstrates how London exercised a gravitational pull on rich and poor alike. The city was the heart of trade, manufacturing and the manipulation of money. It was the home of the royal court, with its countless civil-list pensioners; of Parliament, which transacted an immense part of not just public, but local and even private business for the nation; and of uniquely metropolitan institutions like the higher law courts, a monopoly of printing and publishing and the ‘royal’ theatres.\textsuperscript{83} Here, Barber relied upon letters of introduction from Swift to make contact with polite society. Swift was Barber’s principal connection to the aristocratic and literary spheres in London. His clerical position, literary reputation, and stature as an important social figure who knew many, if not

\textsuperscript{81} Murray G.H. Pittock explains: ‘White was the colour of the Stuarts (as well as the Bourbons, hence its popularity with the Irish Brigades), and a ribbon set in a cockade was a badge of loyalty.’ And, ‘the white rose and associated white cockade are genuine examples of cross-class Jacobite display: worn by the gentry in Bath in the 1740s, they were also found in the first half of the eighteenth century in popular protest from Dublin to Shrewsbury.’ Those supporting the established Hanoverian monarchy wore black. See Murray G.H. Pittock, \textit{Jacobitism} (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1998), 66; 73. See also Eamonn Ó Ciardha, \textit{Ireland and the Jacobite Cause, 1685-1766: A Fatal Attachment} (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2004).

\textsuperscript{82} Barber, \textit{Poems}, 227.

most, of Barber’s subscribers in England and Ireland, lent considerable prestige to the project. Since his early days in London, Swift had formed various acquaintances with several influential peers. An erstwhile Whig in 1703, Swift had turned to serve the Tory government in 1710. In her Preface, Barber acknowledged the primacy of Swift’s endorsements and how his name facilitated her entrée into London society:

I have the highest Sense of the generous Treatment I have met with from many of the Nobility and Gentry of England. Surely there was something truly Noble in their condescending to treat an obscure Person, a Woman, and a Stranger, with so much Goodness, which I shall ever gratefully remember, nor think myself the less indebted there, although I am convinc’d that the Foundation of this Felicity was laid, next to Providence, in the Recommendation with which Dr. SWIFT had honor’d me, to whom I am oblig’d beyond Expression.

Swift’s letters written on Barber’s behalf were addressed to old friends in London. Corresponding with Barber in 1731, Swift assembled a list of twenty-eight potential names — the majority of whom were aristocratic and political friends — who could be counted upon for their support. On further reflection, Swift added a postscript to the letter with a further sixteen names. Swift wrote: ‘If the people already named and any others who know me be told that it is by my request and earnest recommendation I should fancy they will not refuse.’ Of the forty-four potential supporters whom Swift suggested in his letter to Barber, twenty-six subscribed. There was something in this for Swift too. On the periphery in Dublin, Swift enjoyed controlling Barber’s support in London. Swift made a particularly authoritative appeal to Edward Harley, Lord Oxford (1664–1735), the son of Robert Harley, first earl of Oxford, with whom Swift had worked so closely between 1710 and 1714: ‘My request is that all your Family, Friends and Relations (who have not done it already) should

---

84 Ian Higgins’s study exposes the interpretative problems present in Swift’s political writing and the difficulty in determining Swift as either an Old Whig or a non-Jacobite Tory. Ian Higgins, Swift’s Politics: A Study in Disaffection (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
85 Barber, Poems, xxiv.
by your Commands immediately become her Subscribers; and that my Lady Oxford and Lady Margaret shall be her particular Protectors.87 Harley subscribed for two copies, while his wife Lady Henrietta Cavendish Harley (1694–1755), subscribed for a further copy.88 Swift wrote on Barber’s behalf noting: ‘Since I writ this Letter upon talking with Mrs. Barber, she told me with the greatest marks of gratitude, what Honor & favor she received from your Lordship & My Lady Oxford.’89 Oxford’s friend, James Brydges, first Duke of Chandos (1673–1744), is another prominent name on Swift’s list.90 Many contemporary readers of Pope’s An Epistle to the Right Honourable Richard, Earl of Burlington (London, 1731), subtitled and commonly called Of Taste, equated the bad taste of Timon’s villa with the Duke’s ostentatious country seat at Canons.91 Barber’s address, ‘To his Grace the Duke of Chandos’, attempted to ingratiate herself with Brydges, by suggesting that as a patron, Chandos’s eminence and generosity gave his support a godlike quality: ‘Were Princes grac’d with Souls like thine, / Princes had still be deem’d divine’.92 However, despite Barber’s praise, Chandos subscribed for just one copy of Barber’s Poems. Scottish peer, John Campbell, second Duke of Argyll (1680–1743), who would later subscribe to Laetitia Pilkington’s Memoirs, subscribed for a copy along with his wife.93 Several subscriptions from Irish peers were also collected in England such as those of Charles Butler, second Earl of Arran, who subscribed along with his wife and John Boyle, later fifth earl of Orrery, who

88 Henrietta was the third daughter of Henry Cavendish, second Duke of Newcastle upon Tyne. Mary Pendarves (later Mrs Delany) wrote in 1734 that she was ‘afraid Lady O. would have come’ to join a party, and that ‘her formality would not by any means have agreed with the liberty of this constitution’. Lucy Worseley, ‘Harley, Henrietta Cavendish, countess of Oxford and Mortimer (1694–1755)’, in ODNB, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/53530. See also Llanover, Autobiography and correspondence of Mary Granville, Mrs Delany, 2:230.
89 Swift, Corr. 3: 684.
92 Barber, Poems, 57.
subscribed, along with his father Charles, fourth earl of Orrery. 

Swift’s authoritative approach to aristocratic subscribers — or what Barber referred to in her Preface as ‘the fine rallying of a powerful Hand’ — was also successful in procuring subscriptions from aristocratic women. The Countess Granville subscribed on account of Swift, declaring: ‘I have received the honour of y[ou]r commands and shall obey them, for I am very proud of your remembrance.’ The Duchess of Queensberry also wrote to Swift, stating: ‘I will obey y[ou]r commands & so will his grace concerning Mrs Barber.’ Swift further acknowledged Lady Frances Worsley’s acceptance of ‘the honour to be one of [Barber’s] protectors’, and her determination ‘to be one of [Barber’s] principal recommenders and encouragers.’ Lady Worsley was probably instrumental in encouraging subscriptions from family connections who appear on Barber’s list, such as Lord Viscount Weymouth, the Countess of Winchelsea (not to be confused with Anne Finch, Countess of Winchelsea), Lady Elizabeth Finch, John Finch, and William Finch. The following year, Swift wrote again to Lady Worsley to convey Barber’s gratitude: ‘I never saw any person so full of acknowledgement as Mrs Barber for Your Ladyships continued favours to her.’ That Swift both wrote and replied on Barber’s behalf demonstrates the extent of his influence and involvement in Barber’s subscription process.

**Four Women Collectors**

Along with letters to his aristocratic connections and literary friends, Swift wrote directly to Barber from Dublin, in an effort to organise the details of her subscription and

---

94 In an otherwise scrupulously researched and accurate note to Swift’s letter, Woolley has mistakenly included the Duke of Leeds as a subscriber to Barber’s Poems. See Swift, Corr. 3: 364.
95 Barber, Poems, xxiii.
96 Swift, Corr. 3: 710.
98 Swift, Corr. 3: 393.
marshal further support. He first sought to convene four women ‘Collectors’ who would assist Barber in gathering both names and money on her behalf in London. The term ‘collector’ in this context meant someone who would collect the subscription guineas for Barber’s *Poems*.

The urgency with which Swift commanded the assistance of these four women suggests that Barber’s subscription was attracting considerable support and that these women were an asset to Barber’s solicitation: ‘I desire that Mrs Britton shou’d be one of your Collectors Mrs Caesar shall be another and you must get somebody to let Lady Catherine Hyde know that I command her to be a third, and her neice Sharlotte (who refus’d to read to me) her Assistant’. It is surprising that these women have never featured in any discussion of Barber’s subscription process. Mrs. Britton, who subscribed to Barber’s *Poems* along with her son William Britton (1700–1770), was the widow of Thomas Britton (1644–1714), a concert promoter, book collector and coal merchant in Clerkenwell, London.

Mrs. Britton’s efforts largely rested on the basis of her husband’s connections. Thomas Britton, who had died in 1714, had considerable fame in London owing to his sonorous bass voice which apparently towered above the street cries of the trading mob. Swift could be certain his London readers would be able to understand his allusion to Britton when he had a singing coal-dealer among the petty and shady figures of London in his urban pastoral ‘A Description of the Morning’ published in *The Tatler*, 1709: ‘The Smallcoal Man was heard with Cadence

---

100 Swift to Barber, 23 February 1730/1’. *Corr.* 3: 171–172. Swift’s letter to Barber was sent two months after Lady Elizabeth Germain’s letter to Swift stating that she had missed Barber at Tunbridge. It is possible that Swift decided to take a fresh approach to Barber’s subscription by giving Barber clear instructions as to how she should proceed in gathering support. Ironically, Germain wrote to Swift stating that she had just met Barber the same day that Swift wrote this letter to Barber. However, Swift would not have received Germain’s letter until sometime after.


deep, / Till drown’d in shriller notes of Chimney Sweep’. Britton was also a bibliophile and a talented amateur musician. He pioneered the public concert — famously rearranging the loft of his Clerkenwell house as a tiny concert hall, and fitting it with both harpsichord and organ. His ‘concerts’ were regarded as the premier venue for chamber music in London, with an audience drawn from a wide social spectrum. Thus, the Brittons were well placed to gather subscriptions from a cross-section of society. Their home in Clerkenwell, a short walk from the city, had become a fashionable area of residence during the seventeenth and early-eighteenth centuries. Several aristocrats had houses there, most notably the Duke of Northumberland, the first Duke of Newcastle, and the Earl of Clanricarde — all of whom subscribed to Barber’s Poems. Clerkenwell had further significance for Barber as the birthplace of the Gentleman’s Magazine — founded by Edward Cave in 1731. Barber published several poems in this magazine during her time in England.

Mary Caesar is perhaps the most well-known collector on Swift’s list. Born Mary Freman (1677–1741), she earned notoriety as a garden designer, letter-writer and diarist. She is most famous for keeping a journal of her political convictions from the age of forty-seven until her death. Along with her husband, Caesar was an idealistic and ardent Jacobite. She was assiduous in cultivating acquaintances, the object of which was not simply to engender friendship, but to establish the solidarity of a circle devoted to the support

---

104 Louis A. Landa remarks that ‘any reader of this poem would almost certainly think of Thomas Britton. Swift may have had him in mind ... He held musical concerts at his shop (in a back street off Clerkenwell Green) for forty years, attended by noted artists (such as Handel and Pepusch) and titled aristocrats. He was also a book collector, particularly interested in the occult science. There was actually a song about him: ‘Come hear me fiddle, read my books, / Or buy my smallcoal, maids.’ Louis A. Landa, Gulliver’s Travels and Other Writings (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1960), 550.


108 When her husband was imprisoned in the Tower, where Oxford was confined since 1715, Mary Caesar was zealous in visiting and carrying messages for the Tory prisoners. See Dorothy Potter, The Journal of Mary Freeman Caesar, 18.
of a legitimate monarch, which (for the Caesars after the death of Queen Anne in 1714), meant the exiled Stuart line. She cultivated Tories whenever she could, confronting them with the texts, pictures and historical parallels which, in her view, made Jacobitism the necessary consequence of political integrity.  

Caesar also ran errands for the Duchess of Buckingham, was chaperone to Lady Masham’s daughter, and a close associate of the Harleys, Thomas Prior, and Charles Jervas. She corresponded regularly with Swift and was also close with Pope and Orrery. Poetry played a major role in Mary Caesar’s cult of Jacobite virtue and her great love for the poetry of Tory loyalists; especially those known personally to her. More significantly, Caesar was a principal promoter of Matthew Prior’s subscription; and Pope, who had benefited from her zeal, and had told Lord Oxford that she ‘never wrote a letter but to a good purpose’. Caesar recruited no less than seventy subscribers for Pope’s translation of the *Odyssey* (1726) and, in recognition of her effort on his behalf Pope placed an asterisk by her capitalised name on the list of subscribers.

Caesar was also impressed by Barber: ‘Mrs Barber is Happy In a Quickness of Thought, Which Tallant the Late Lord Oxford was wont to tell me Chiefly Belong’d to Our sex.’ Barber’s ‘quickness of thought’ had already worked to her advantage in the poems she wrote at Tunbridge Wells and Bath; in London, she would need intermediary support. Caesar worked hard to raise subscriptions for Barber, and Swift acknowledged her help on

---


110 Correspondence exchanged between Swift and Caesar mention Pope. Swift, *Corr.* 3: 520, 554, 677. Pope corresponded with Mary Caesar from at least 1723. Woolley observes that ‘a charming vanished moment (of uncertain date) is recalled in Mrs. Caesar’s poetical exchange with Pope’. In her scrap-book of 30 leaves, there is an autograph couplet by Pope which is mounted above a quatrain addressed by Mary Caesar in reply to Pope. She notes ‘Mr. Pope came in person with thanks.’ Pope quoted to her a line from his own *Works* which appears to have been from *Windsor Forest*, which he sent her later with the couplet. See Woolley, Swift, *Corr.* 3: 364. Mrs. Caesar also mentions Pope in relation to letter writing and spelling: ‘I must look if it runs not from Corner to Corner. which I fear more than length. for Pope says. tho sometimes he finds too many letters in my words. Never too many words in my letters.’ See Swift, *Corr.* 3: 520.


112 ‘I took another liberty with Your own Name, which you knew nothing of, nor I dare say could have Suspected; & have made a Star of Mrs Caesar, as well as of Mrs Fermor. If any body asks you the reason of this, quote to ’em this verse of Virgil, - *Processit Caesaris astrum.*’ Pope, *Corr.*, 2 : 293. Pope quotes Virgil, *Eclogues*, 9.47 (‘Caesar’s star has risen’). Rumbold, *Women’s Place in Pope’s World*, 231.

Barber’s behalf: ‘[Mrs. Barber] in a letter she lately writ to a very worthy friend of hers & mine, hath much enlarged upon the very favourable reception you are pleased to give her.’\textsuperscript{114} When Barber returned to Dublin, Swift wrote again: ‘Mrs. Barber when I see her is always telling me wonders of the continual favours you have conferred on her, and that without your interposition the success of her errand would have hardly been worth the journey.’\textsuperscript{115} Sir John Hynde Cotton (1686-1752), a leading Tory opponent of Sir Robert Walpole and committed Jacobite, was probably collected through Mary Caesar, whose husband, Charles, was a leading member of Cotton’s Jacobite Tory circle.\textsuperscript{116}

Mary Caesar was also a patron in her own right. By 1733, Swift wrote to Mrs. Caesar describing her as Barber’s ‘chief Patronness’: ‘I imagine [Barber] looks on you as her chief Patronness; because, although she be abundantly grateful to all her Protectors; yet I observe your name most often in her mouth.’\textsuperscript{117} Barber dedicated two poems to Caesar, providing evidence of their close association: ‘The Author who had been engag’d to dine with Mrs. Caesar, was excus’d by that Lady, upon an Invitation from Lord Carteret’s; and the next Day Mrs. Caesar was invited by the Speaker, which occasion’d the following Lines — To Mrs. Caesar, at the Speaker’s Lodgings in Bath’, and, ‘To Mrs. Mary Caesar, upon seeing her just after the Marriage of her friend, the Lady Margaret Harley’.\textsuperscript{118} The poems highlight the women’s public connections to Lord Carteret, Arthur Onslow, (Speaker to the House of Commons) and Edward Harley, second Earl of Oxford, his daughter, Lady Margaret Harley, and her husband, William Bentinck, second Duke of Portland in 1734. All of the above subscribed to Barber’s \textit{Poems}: Lord Carteret for five books; Arthur Onslow for four copies and Lord Oxford for a further four books.

\textsuperscript{114} Swift, \textit{Corr.} 3: 346.  
\textsuperscript{115} Swift, \textit{Corr.} 3: 554.  
\textsuperscript{117} Swift, \textit{Corr.} 3: 677.  
\textsuperscript{118} Barber, \textit{Poems}, 156-157.
Swift also requested the assistance of Lady Catherine Hyde and her niece Charlotte. Both were related to literary patron and socialite, Catherine Hyde, Duchess of Queensberry (1701–1777) — most famous for her outrage at the lord chamberlain’s refusal to license the performance of John Gay’s Polly (London, 1729).\(^{119}\) Queensberry proved active in gathering support at court until she was barred on account of her dealings with Gay. Mary Pendarves, who was a friend of the Duchess, wrote on the affair: ‘When Walpole arranged to forbid the production of Polly, Gay’s sequel to The Beggar’s Opera, Gay took steps to print it by subscription. The Duchess then made herself so obnoxious to Walpole at court, by drumming up subscribers there, that the King banished her from the royal presence. The Duke took the opportunity to resign his remaining offices.’\(^{120}\) The play, which was successfully published by subscription, satirised Sir Robert Walpole, thus leading George II to bar her from court and Queensberry to resign his offices. Mary Barber’s poem on the Duchess of Queensberry, ‘Stella and Flavia’, was her single most widely published poem: it appeared in three different miscellanies, one newspaper, and both collections between 1734 and 1736.\(^{121}\) Barber’s poem praises ‘Stella’ (Queensberry): ‘Stella, like Britain’s Monarch, reigns / O’er cultivated Lands’.\(^{122}\)

More significantly, both Catherine and Charlotte Hyde enjoyed the friendship of the autobiographer and letter-writer, Mary Pendarves (1700–1788), whom they often visited at her house.\(^{123}\) Pendarves was a significant connection to the London aristocratic circles.\(^{124}\) A high Tory family the Pendarves were important in government circles of the time — Mary’s

---

\(^{119}\) Lady Catherine Hyde was aunt to her namesake. Charlotte was the Duchess of Queensbury’s sister. Swift, *Corr.*, 3: 291-293; 363-365.

\(^{120}\) Llanover, *Autobiography and Correspondence of Mary Delany*, 1: 194.

\(^{121}\) Pendarves to Granville 13 August 1732: ‘The verses on Stella and Flavia positively are Mrs. Barber’s’, Llanover, *Autobiography and Correspondence of Mary Delany*, 1: 372.

\(^{122}\) Barber, *Poems*, 126.

\(^{123}\) Llanover, *Autobiography and Correspondence of Mary Delany*, 1: 387, 595.

cousin was John, Lord Carteret (Barber’s patron in Dublin). The niece of Lord Lansdowne (George Granville) and intended for preferment at the court of Queen Anne, Mary Pendarves was also close friends with Lady Margaret Harley Cavendish, the Duchess of Portland. When Alexander Pendarves died in 1724, Pendarves cultivated her independence among the high society of London. Mary Pendarves owned no home of her own following her husband’s death – lived a nomadic lifestyle among relatives and friends, moving between Whitehall (Charing Cross) and Northend, and Lower Brook Street (near Bond Street). She particularly enjoyed the opera, and along with her brother Bernard ‘Bunny’ Granville, promoted the new Italian style and supported George Frederick Handel. Both Mary Pendarves and Bernard Granville (who was also a regular at Bath) subscribed for a copy of Barber’s Poems. Barber’s connection with Pendarves would be rekindled when Pendarves travelled to Dublin in 1731 and became a significant figure in Dublin circles. Swift’s acknowledgement of these women points to the agency that women had in mobilizing support in London.

**Swift, Germain and an employment for Barber’s husband**

Swift’s correspondence with Lady Elizabeth Germain (1680–1769) further demonstrates his supervision of Barber’s subscription/personal affairs in London. As lady-in-waiting to Queen Anne in the years before her marriage, Germain was powerfully placed in political society, while her close friendship with her cousin, the Duke of Dorset, further placed her in prominent Whig circles of the day. Germain’s friendship with Swift began when her father Charles, second Earl of Berkeley, went to Ireland as a Lord Justice in 1699, taking Swift with him as chaplain and secretary.¹²⁵ During the 1730s, Swift and Lady

---

Germain exchanged many letters; Swift hoped to use her influence on his behalf.\textsuperscript{126} Many of the letters from Swift are lost; however, Lady Germain’s replies demonstrate Swift’s influence over her: ‘First as to Mrs. Barber, as I told you before so I tell you the same again that upon your recommendation I shall be very glad to serve her’.\textsuperscript{127} Germain recounts, the delays in post (notorious in the eighteenth century due to poor roads) meant that she and Barber failed to meet during Barber’s first summer at Tunbridge Wells: ‘I never did see her, and as I had not your letter till I went from Tunbridge she passed unmarked by me in the crowd, nor have I met with her since.’\textsuperscript{128} It was during this summer that Barber penned her dedication, ‘To the Right Honourable the Lady Elizabeth Germain upon seeing her do a generous Action’, printed in \textit{Tunbridge Miscellanies} (1730). Despite the poem’s subtitle — ‘Written as from the Person relieved’ — Barber had neither met nor received any support from Germain at this point. Instead, the poem anticipates Germain’s support:

\begin{quote}
\begin{verbatim}
When Ruin threaten’d me of late,
With all its ghastly Train;
Some Pow’r, in Pity to my Fate,
Sent bountiful Germain.\textsuperscript{129}
\end{verbatim}
\end{quote}

Despite her clever lines here, Barber made a mistake in the poem’s execution. Writing to Swift, Germain recalled the circumstances in which the poem was delivered to her. She explained how she ‘was Gaming’ when ‘the dapper youths deliver[ed] me a paper.’\textsuperscript{130} Glancing at the paper and noticing the verses, she simply ‘slunk them into my pocket’, and forgot about them: ‘and there truly they were kept exceeding private for I cannot accuse myself of showing them to a mortal, but let me assure you ’twas not out of Modesty but in great hopes that the Author would have divulged them, which you know, would have lookt

\textsuperscript{126} Irvin Ehrenpreis observes that ‘although the renewal of ancient friendship gave [Swift] various satisfactions, he stopped writing when the ulterior motive lapsed.’ The same is true of Swift’s correspondence on Barber’s behalf. See Ehrenpreis, Swift, 3: 700.
\textsuperscript{127} Swift, \textit{Corr.} 3: 351.
\textsuperscript{128} Swift, \textit{Corr.} 3: 351.
\textsuperscript{129} Barber, \textit{Poems}, 116.
\textsuperscript{130} Swift, \textit{Corr.} 3: 351.
decenter and prityer than trumpeting my own fame but it seems unhappily we were both bitt and judged wrong of each other.\textsuperscript{131} Norma Clarke has observed that, Barber’s blunder was in employing young — and thus probably cheap — emissaries, rather than delivering the poems in person.\textsuperscript{132} Certainly, while Germain was annoyed that she was the only one to read the panegyric, it was Barber who missed the greater opportunity to present her poem to Germain and, in so doing, advertise her subscription to those present. This was a simple misunderstanding; nonetheless it highlights the delicate nature of seeking support. Subscriptions had to be tactfully negotiated, and a sense of timing was imperative.

However, Barber managed to capitalise on the publication of Pilkington’s \textit{Poems on Several Occasions} (1730). It was a chance to introduce herself personally to Germain, and, as Germain’s letter to Swift shows, this occasion was also an opportunity to procure an audience with the Duke of Dorset: ‘She writ to me to present [Pilkington’s] Poems to the Duke and Duchess of Dorset. I answered her letter and Obey’d her Commands’.\textsuperscript{133} The Irish edition of Pilkington’s \textit{Poems on Several Occasions}, was presented to the Dorsets at Knole in 1731.\textsuperscript{134} Lady Germain would also ‘willingly subscribe’ to Barber’s poems. However, she was far more equivocal in her praise of Barber’s writing, being ‘of the opinion we ladies are not apt to be good Poets especially if we can’t spell.’\textsuperscript{135} Germain’s teasing comment on women poets — which may gesture towards her own contributions to Swift’s writing in Dublin — offers a

\textsuperscript{131} Swift, \textit{Corr.} 3: 351.
\textsuperscript{132} Woolley notes that the youthful messenger is conjectured to be Barber’s second son Rupert, jun. (born 1719), however, as I will later demonstrate, Barber’s poems written at Tunbridge at this time suggest that the author was alone in England. Furthermore, her attempts to secure subscriptions would have been all consuming so it is unlikely that she would take her young son with her. Swift, \textit{Corr.} 3: 352.
\textsuperscript{133} Swift, \textit{Corr.} 3: 351.
\textsuperscript{134} Matthew Pilkington’s \textit{Poems on Several Occasions} was printed by Faulkner in Dublin in 1730, with a list of 247 subscribers, and dedicated to the Right Honourable, Robert, Earl of Kildare. Pilkington’s \textit{Poems on Several Occasions} was also printed in London the same year.
\textsuperscript{135} Swift, \textit{Corr.} 3: 351.
useful insight into the ambivalent support Barber sometimes contended with. Barber’s ‘Account of how I succeeded in my Subscription’, pointedly conveys the hauteur of the women aristocrat who frowns on a scribbling woman:

Then FULVIA made this sage Reply;
(And look’d with self-sufficient Eye).
I oft have said, and say again,
Verses are only writ by Men;
I know a Woman cannot write;
I do not say this out of Spite;
Nor shall be thought, by those who know me,
To envy one so much below me.

In practice, Germain proved more amenable than the ‘Flavia’ of this poem. When she and Barber finally met in September 1731 Germain wrote again to Swift, telling him that that she ‘saw Mrs Barber the day before I came out of town and should be mighty glad to serve her’. However, Germain was not impressed by Barber’s husband, Rupert: ‘I can’t say so much by her husband whom for her sake I recommended to the Duke of Dorset to buy his Liveries on.’ Germain’s letter shows that Barber had a two-fold objective in England. Along with gathering support for her poems she also hoped to secure a contract from the incoming lord lieutenant of Ireland, the Duke of Dorset, to purchase the linen for liveries — uniforms for footmen — from the Barbers upon his arrival to Dublin Castle in September 1731. Germain pronounced a terse judgement that implied Rupert’s fecklessness and incompetence: ‘the first thing he did was to ask a greater price than any body else and when we were at Whitechurch where I attended their Graces, he was informed he had not Cloth

---

136 Swift spent much of his time with the Berkeleys at Dublin Castle, playing cards and reading aloud to Lady ‘Betty’. Nearly thirty years later, in a letter to Swift (19 September 1730), Lady Germain recalled a line from Swift’s ‘The Humble Petition of Frances Harris’, written in Ireland in 1701: ‘Lord help me, said Mary, I never stirred out of this place! / Nay, said I, I had it in Lady Betty’s Chamber, that’s a plain Case.’ Swift returned to England with the Berkeleys in 1701 and during his visit to Berkeley Castle in 1702, permitted Lady ‘Betty’ to add a final stanza to his poem ‘A Ballad on the Game of Traffick’. Swift, Poems, 68-73, 117-18.

137 Barber, Poems, 275.
enough in his shop and they feared they would not be ready against he came over. Rupert Barber’s reluctance to accept Dorset’s offer is extraordinary given the potential of a linen contract with Dublin Castle. The well-meaning sought to make the wearing of Irish textiles de rigeur. Under the Carteret administration, the viceregal couple promoted an initiative to wear linen at Dublin Castle and popularise Irish wares. Vicereine Lady Carteret asked the ladies to wear only Irish damask. The Duke of Dorset, who arrived in Dublin on 13 September 1731, also tried to boost the manufacture of Irish linen throughout his viceroyalty. Between 1734 and 1736, Dorset and his wife spent more than £100 on linen from two Dublin merchants. In a letter to Swift on 4 November 1731, Germain wrote: ‘I mightily approve of my duchess [of Dorset] being dressed in your manufacture; if your ladies will follow her example in all things, they cannot go amiss.’ Mrs. Pendarves wrote to her sister Anne Granville about the popularity of Irish poplin at the Irish Court: ‘Mrs. Donnellan and I have each of us made a brown stuff (poplin) manteau and petticoat, and have worn them twice at assemblies.’ In Rupert’s defence, his reluctance to provide linen at a cheap rate was not altogether exclusive to him. Toby Barnard has documented how Irish shopkeepers were regularly short-changed in their dealings, and thus, remained sceptical about entering into business with those at Dublin Castle. In 1731 Katherine Conolly (wife of Speaker William Conolly) observed that the ladies at the Castle wore ‘the richest clothes ever ... seen here’, adding, ‘in the mean [time], the shopkeepers have the worst of it, for of many thousand pounds laid out, very few hundreds are paid.’ Similarly, when Lady Carteret had asked the ladies to wear only Irish damask, there was not enough to supply the demand. Rupert Barber’s announcement that ‘he had not Cloth enough in his shop’ may also have been

141 Toby Barnard, Making the Grand Figure: Lives and Possessions in Ireland 1641-1770 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 254.
142 Barnard, Making the Grand Figure, 259.
143 Swift, Corr. 3: 442.
145 Quoted in Toby Barnard, Making the Grand Figure, 254.
justified, particularly as Dorset was to arrive in September 1731 (the date of this letter).

Despite the best efforts of Swift, Mary Barber and Germain, Rupert’s hesitancy cost the family a potentially lucrative position (and made Barber look foolish). Barber remained reticent about her husband’s shortcomings — which was in itself an indication of her loyalty, her virtue or, perhaps, her exasperation. She would have to be content to be well-received, or even pitied, by Dorset who subscribed for ten copies of Barber’s *Poems*, and Germain who subscribed for a further five books. Germain was also likely responsible for the subscription of Mrs. Biddy Floyd, a friend of Swift to whom he dedicated ‘On Mrs. Biddy Floyd’.  

*Scriblerian support in London*

Swift also requested support from his Scriblerian friends John Arbuthnot (1667–1735) — who erroneously appears on Barber’s subscription list as ‘James Arbuthnott, M.D’— John Gay, and Alexander Pope. The Scriblerians had experience with printing by subscription and had varied contacts with literary and aristocratic circles in London. All three subscribed to Barber’s *Poems* and did their best to muster further backing on Swift’s insistence. Dr. Arbuthnot who had assisted Barber in securing the raffle of diamond earrings at Tunbridge Wells the previous summer, wrote to Swift on 5 November 1730: ‘I have showed as much civility to Mrs Barber as I could, and she likewise to me.’  

John Gay expressed genuine eagerness to be of service. Barber had already made a connection with him when her poem, ‘A True Tale’, was printed in 1728. The poem, written in praise of Gay’s *Fables* (1728), appealed to Queen Caroline to grant the poet a pension: ‘Who thus instructs the Royal Race, /

146 A postscript to her reply to Swift reads: ‘Mrs. Floyd is much yours but Dumber than ever having a Violent Cold.’ Swift, *Corr*. 3: 365. Bridget ‘Biddy’ Floyd was known for her beauty before her brush with smallpox, which Barber made reference to in ‘Apollo’s Edict’: ‘With Women compounds I am cloy’d, / Which only pleas’d in Biddy Floyd’. Barber, *Poems*, 105.


Must have a Pension, or a Place.'\textsuperscript{149} In a letter to Swift on 11 April 1731, Gay recalled his visit to Barber, and was anxious to ‘put in a good word’ to anyone who might subscribe: ‘Just before I left London I made a visit to Mrs. Barber, I wish I could any ways have contributed to her subscription; I have always found myself of no consequence and am now of less than ever. I propos’d it before Jo Taylor, who upon hearing she was a friend of yours, offer’d his subscription and desired his compliments to you.’\textsuperscript{150} Gay’s resigned tone was typical of his correspondence during this time.\textsuperscript{151} However, despite Gay’s claim here, his patronage connection to the Queensberrys undoubtedly proved useful for Barber. After the success of \textit{The Beggar’s Opera} in 1728, with its satirical strokes against Walpole, John Gay increasingly enjoyed their patronage. Both subscribed to Barber’s \textit{Poems}.\textsuperscript{152} Joseph Taylor (ca. 1679–1759) whom Gay mentions in this letter, also subscribed.\textsuperscript{153} A Tory barrister, Taylor was Bolingbroke’s executor and also corresponded with Swift in March 1728.\textsuperscript{154}

Pope, who was less cheerful owing to his chronic illness, took pains to explain to Swift that despite his reclusive lifestyle, he would do his best to assist Barber in her subscription effort: ‘Whatever Service I can render to her, by speaking well etc. I will. Whatever Friends I can get to Subscribe to her, I will. But you know my Circle is vastly Contracted, as I seldom have been out of the Country these two Years. All your Friends She will have without me; and all their Friends. But I’ll do all I can.’\textsuperscript{155} Pope had a famously successful experience with subscription publishing; his decision to produce editions of

\textsuperscript{149} Mary Barber, \textit{Poems}, 11.
\textsuperscript{150} Swift, \textit{Corr.}, 3: 376.
\textsuperscript{151} In a letter to Swift on 22 October 1727, Gay wrote: ‘As I am used to disappointments I can bear them, but as I can have no more hopes, I can be no more disappointed, so that I am in a blessed condition.’ Swift, \textit{Corr.} 3: 170.
\textsuperscript{153} Taylor was a Tory barrister and member of the Inner Temple — one of the four Inns of Court. He was also a clerk of both Bridewell and Bethlehem Hospitals between 1707 and 1759, and MP of Stanmore, Middlesex. See Woolley note, Swift, \textit{Corr.} 3:171.
\textsuperscript{154} Swift to Gay, 28 March 1728: ‘I had a letter from Jo Taylor last Post, recommending one Waghern for my Quire.’ Woolley identifies Waghern as John Waghorne, vicar-choral from 1726 until his death in 1733. Swift \textit{Corr.} 3: 171-172.
Homer’s *Iliad* (1720) and *Odyssey* (1726) by subscription proved both popular and financially advantageous.\(^{156}\) He was also a fruitful source of connections. Pope shared mutual aristocratic associations with Swift and his intimacy with female members of the nobility was no less extensive.\(^{157}\) Pope’s friendship with Lord Bathurst (1684–1775) served as an important point of intersection between Swift, Bathurst and Barber in London.\(^{158}\) In early October 1730, when Swift wrote to Lord Bathurst to announce Barber’s arrival in London and communicate her plan to apply to Dorset for employment, he relied on their mutual friendship with Pope to verify Barber’s arrival in London and recommend her talents as a poet: ‘I reckon this season is driving you up to St. James’s Square, where this letter will find you, where Mr Pope will tell you, that there is an Irish Poetess now in London, soliciting the Duke of Dorset for an Employment.’\(^{159}\) Both Pope and Swift knew Lord Bathurst from his early involvement with the government of Queen Anne.\(^{160}\) A staunch Tory, along with friends Orrery, Lord and Lady Masham, Bathurst vehemently castigated the persecution of Bolingbroke and Oxford during the Walpole administration, and publicly leapt to the defence of Francis Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester, who was impeached in 1723 for Jacobite


\(^{157}\) Pope’s acquaintance who appear on Barber’s subscription list include: Katherine Sheffield, Duchess of Buckingham; the Countess of Burlington; Elizabeth Douglas, Duchess of Hamilton; Sarah Churchill, Duchess of Marlborough; Lady Blunt (wife of Sir John Blunt, a director of the South Sea Company); Lady Cox (a sister to Hugh Bethel, one of Pope’s oldest and steadiest friends); Sir Clement Cottrell (1686–1758) and his wife Lady Cottrell, who had property in Twickenham; Lady Frances Harcourt, and Lady Elizabeth Rich (friend of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu). See Pope, *Corr.* 5: 21-48. On the Bethel and Burlington connections in Yorkshire, see Pat Rogers, *Essays on Pope* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 129-164.


\(^{159}\) Swift, *Corr.* 3: 328.

\(^{160}\) Woolley counts eight letters exchanged between Bathurst and Swift in 1729-30, which were written nearly two decades after their initial encounter. The last letter between the two friends was written some eight years later. Only three from Swift survive — all the rest being burnt after Bathurst’s death by his son Henry, the second Earl, judge and politician, ‘because several of the letters were indiscreet.’ Swift, *Corr.* 3: 283.
Pope celebrated Bathurst’s magnificence and wealth, addressing the third of his Moral Essays to him: *Of the Use of the Riches: An Epistle to Lord Bathurst*, printed in London in 1733. Bathurst, at the heart of London cultural life, was perfectly placed to introduce Barber to aristocratic London. He owned impressive homes which stood as symbols of his éclat and were also the focus of social gatherings during the period. Cirencester House in Gloucestershire, complete with sprawling forest park, established a glorious public display of Bathurst’s aristocratic power, while his residence at St. James’s Square strengthened Bathurst’s position at the locus of wealth and culture in early eighteenth-century London. During the 1720s, this square was one of the three or four most fashionable locales in London, and was home to nobles such as the Dukes of Kent and Norfolk; the Earls of Ormond, Pembroke, and Sunderland; and Viscount Torrington. Bathurst’s connections must have proved fruitful to Barber: all six of these peers subscribed to her volume.

Pope was likely to have been responsible for other subscriptions such as that of his correspondent, Honourable William Leveson-Gower. Mrs. Jennings (a relative of Lord Harcourt whom Pope admired, and whom Harcourt suggested Pope might marry) subscribed to Barber’s *Poems* as did Pope’s mother, Edith, who features on Barber’s list as ‘Mrs. Pope, Twickenham’. Historian and author Nathaniel Hooke (d. 1763), one of Pope’s lifelong

†††

163 Mack describes Bathurst’s extravagant ‘Brobdingnagian schemes of afforestation and landscaping’ for his huge estate in Gloucestershire, which even included a fanciful design for uniting the Thames and Severn rivers. Mack, *Alexander Pope*, 371-373.
friends since their schooldays at Twyford, subscribed to Barber’s Poems.\textsuperscript{165} The natural philosopher Dr. Stephen Hales (1679–1761), who was Pope’s neighbour, likely supported Barber through her connection with Pope.\textsuperscript{166} Pope’s physicians and practitioners (of which there were several) are also present on Barber’s subscription list, including Simon Burton (Pope’s physician at his death), Sir John Shadwell (physician to Queen Anne) and Dr. Richard Mead (1673–1754). Mead was one of the most celebrated physicians of the time.\textsuperscript{167} He was also a physician to Queen Anne in her last days in 1714, and also to King George II and Queen Caroline, and later to Mary Barber herself, when increasingly plagued by fits of gout. Mead subscribed along with his wife for two books, possibly in return for Barber’s poetic dedication, ‘Written at Dr. Mead’s House in Ormond-Street, to Mrs. Mead’, which praised him for his choice of spouse: ‘Mead’s Taste in ev’ry thing we view; / But chiefly in his Choice of You.’\textsuperscript{168}

Despite Pope’s willingness to assist in the gathering of support for Barber, he drew the line at improving her poems: ‘Mrs. Barber desires I would correct her Verses, truly I should do it very ill, for I can give no Attention to any thing.’\textsuperscript{169} It was one thing to have a senatus consultum in Dublin rallying their efforts to finesse Barber’s poems, but it was quite another to actively approach Pope (who was growing increasingly ill) to review her verse. Barber surely did herself no favours by further requesting Pope to write a poem on the death

\textsuperscript{165} Hooke’s works include The Roman History, translated by Hooke in twenty days at Bath; Travels of Cyrus, with a discourse on Mythology (1739); Observations (1758), dedicated to Speaker Onslow, ‘Six Letters to a Lady of Quality’ (1791). Hook sought to dedicate to Oxford his Life of Fénelon (1723), a translation from the French of the work of Andrew Michael Ramsay. For more on Hooke, see Thompson Cooper, rev. Adam. I. P. Smith, ‘Hooke, Nathaniel (d. 1763),’ in ODNB, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13692 (accessed August 21, 2013).

\textsuperscript{166} A natural philosopher, Hales is best remembered for his pioneering work both in photobiology – especially the effect of sunlight on growing plants published as Vegetable Staticks (1727) and his dramatic demonstration of blood pressure in animals published as Haemastaticks (1733). Pope was good friends with Hales although he criticised Hales’s experimentations with animals. D. G. C. Allan, ‘Hales, Stephen (1677–1761),’ in ODNB, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/11915 (accessed August 21, 2013).


\textsuperscript{168} Barber, Poems, 146.

\textsuperscript{169} Swift, Corr. 3: 374.
of the Earl of Thanet. In ‘To Mr. Pope: Intreating him to write Verses to the Memory of Thomas, late Earl of Thanet, Barber attempts to encourage Pope (who would immortalise Lord Bathurst in his *Epistle to Bathurst*, 1733), to pen a poem for the deceased earl: ‘Let me, unequal to the Task, excite / Thy matchless Muse, to do his Merit Right.’ That poem never materialised, but Barber included her poetic request in her *Poems*. Swift, for his part, attempted to smooth the situation by suggesting that Barber was something of an ingénue in her dealings with the literary establishment: ‘Mrs Barber acted weakly in desiring you to correct her Verses, I desired her friends here to warn her against every thing of that kind. I believe there was a great Combat between her modesty and her Ambition.’ The struggle between female propriety and personal ambition affected Barber’s subscription effort. Subscription-hunting and peer-review was a delicate task, even among a circle of close friends.

**Political subscribers to Barber’s Poems**

One way in which Barber managed to capitalise on connections in London was her solicitation of political subscribers. A distinctive feature of Barber’s printed subscription list is the presence together of several government ministers from both the Whig and Tory parties. Alongside staunch Tory Jacobites such as Oxford, Bathurst and Cotton, there are numerous subscriptions from those who formed part of the Walpole administration and demonstrate the extent of Whig support on Barber’s list. Government ministers William Strickland (1686–1735) and Thomas Townshend (1701–1780) were familiar names in the Walpole administration. The subscription of Henry Pelham (1694–1754), the younger brother of the Duke of Newcastle, is especially notable in this context for supporting Walpole in his

---

power struggle with Barber’s erstwhile patron in Dublin, Lord Carteret.\textsuperscript{172} Robert Nugent (1702–1788), who was both Lord of the Treasury, and Vice-Treasurer of Ireland under Walpole’s regime, also subscribed to Barber’s *Poems*.\textsuperscript{173} Charles Hanbury Williams (1708–1759) a Welsh diplomat, writer, satirist and supporter of Walpole, subscribed along with his wife Lady Frances Coningsby. Sir William Yonge, ‘a parliamentary tool of Walpole’s ready to speak agreeable on the hour on nothing’, incisively satirised by Pope, also supported Barber’s subscription.\textsuperscript{174} Barber’s subscription list also reflects Whig colonial interest overseas. Mr. Martin Bladen (1680–1746), who was appointed Commissioner of the Board of Trade and Plantations in 1717 and was influential in controlling various colonial offices, especially in Carolina, added his name to Barber’s list.\textsuperscript{175} Bladen may also have been responsible for the subscriptions of Mrs. Lawes, wife of Nicholas Lawes; Governor Hart, lord proprietor of Maryland in 1719, and Governor Morrice (1671–1746), after whom Morris Country in New Jersey is named. Adam Budd asserts that it must have been a powerful patron other than Swift who had successfully solicited Sir Robert Walpole and his tenacious allies Lord Halifax, Lord Sunderland, and Sir Joseph Jekyll.\textsuperscript{176} Sir Joseph Jekyll, Master of the Rolls subscribed, along with his wife Lady Jekyll, and would soon be immortalised by Pope as ‘A Joke on Jekyll, or some odd Old Whig, / Who never chang’d his Principle or a Wig.’\textsuperscript{177}

\textsuperscript{172} Pelham’s marriage to Lady Katherine Manners (1700–1780), in 1726, is further represented on Barber’s list by the subscriptions of both Katherine’s father John Manners, second Duke of Rutland and his wife Catherine Russell. ‘Pelham, Henry (1694–1754),’ P. J. Kulisheck in *ODNB*, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/21789 (accessed August 21, 2013).

\textsuperscript{173} A contemporary described Nugent as ‘a jovial and voluptuous Irishman, who had left Popery for the Protestant religion, money and widows’. At the time of this portrait, his wife was Elizabeth, widow of the Fourth Earl of Berkeley, who had strong family connections with Bath.


\textsuperscript{176} Adam Budd, ‘Merit in Distress’, 219.

\textsuperscript{177} Alexander Pope, ‘One Thousand Seven Hundred and Thirty Eight’ (lines 37-8). Quoted in Adam Budd, ‘Merit in Distress’, 219.
The presence of the wily Sir Robert Walpole on Barber’s subscription list is puzzling, especially given his publicly fraught relationship with Swift, Pope, Bathurst, and others of the Tory circle. Both Pope and Swift regularly complained that Walpole disregarded the best authors of the day and apparently cared little or nothing for poetry: he only paid for what Swift ironically called ‘solid Work’ — that is, writing that advanced his political programme. Walpole had, so they claimed, corrupted the process of patronage by politicizing it, his interest merely pragmatic or instrumental: ‘[Walpole] looked upon political writing as a kind of currency that would pass by its nominal value, let its intrinsic worth be ever so inconsiderable.’¹⁷⁸ In practice, it appears that Swift and Pope’s complaints were more indicative of personal dissatisfaction with Walpole rather than Walpole’s policy on writers. Swift and Pope both dined with and satirised Walpole. Goldgar notes how Pope, who was famously aloof from politics and patronage, also sought to gain patronage from the ministry. On 29 April 1725, Pope received £200 as His Majesty’s ‘Encouragement to the Work of Translating the Odyssey of Homer into English Verse’. Walpole subscribed to ten sets of Pope’s *Odyssey* (1726). John Gay regularly, though constantly disappointed, sought to gain favour and preferment at court.

This juxtaposition of political sides appears surprising. However, in practice, this political support on subscription lists was not wholly unusual. Firstly, given that there was not even fixed membership of MPs within political parties during the eighteenth century, it is not altogether remarkable that seemingly incompatible names appear on Barber’s list. Whig and Tory parties were not parties in the modern sense.¹⁷⁹ There were manifold shades of opinion within both, and many who gave allegiance to the Court from both parties. Personal interests and changing opinions often produced a subsequent change of party allegiances.


There were staunch Tory Jacobites such as Bathurst and Oxford, and ardent Whigs such as Halifax and Jekyll, but, somewhere in the middle, there were also those who were first Whig and then Tory such as Swift, or indeed, those who were first Tory and then Whig such as the Duke of Argyll. The ambiguities in Swift’s political position were obvious. Swift saw no contradiction in being a Whig in politics and a Tory in religion before turning to serve the Tories politically (and promote Robert Harley in the *Examiner*) in 1710. For Swift, it was a positive indication of his independence. It is also evident that subscribers saw the act of subscribing independent of political bias. Bertrand Goldgar’s study, *Walpole and the Wits*, has demonstrated how old Tories often associated amicably with younger Whigs: Pope was friends with the Duke of Grafton, the Earl of Halifax and Viscount Cobham. Swift was also friends with Halifax, ‘the only Whig in England I loved’. More recently, Christine Gerrard’s study *The Patriot Opposition to Walpole: Politics, Poetry, and National Myth, 1725-1742* documents the many aspects of the Patriot opposition to Walpole. Gerrard takes into account the transformations which revisionist historians (Nicholas Rogers, Linda Colley, and Kathleen Wilson) of the last two decades have made to the landscape of early Hanoverian party politics, and observes the widely divergent forms of opposition verse and the equally diverse social outlook of its authors. Linda Colley has recently suggested that ‘the patriotism of the past require flexible, sensitive and above all, imaginative reconstruction.’ Simple definitions of Patriot, Whig and Tory may not be adequate. Not simply Pope and Swift on one side, and Walpole on the other, with a couple of opposition

---

180 Bertrand Goldgar, *Walpole and the Wits* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1976), 41-63; 87-216.
Whigs, leavened with a pinch of Jacobitism. Some expressed opposition to Walpole, not in laments for the old order but in the hindering of the new.\(^{183}\) Opposition Whigs were nothing like a political party. They were individuals or alliances of individuals motivated by a variety of factors: some of the frustrated ambition which had led Walpole himself into opposition, others by principles and convictions. A united ‘Country’ opposition was an illusion based on Craftsman-style rhetoric and the highly partial evidence of opposition-lists. The relationship between Tories and opposition Whigs was at best a marriage of convenience marked on both sides by suspicion and mistrust.\(^{184}\) W. A. Speck concludes in his discussion of subscription patronage during the first part of the century that, when it came to subscribing, ‘no connection emerges between types of books and the politics of subscribers.’\(^{185}\) This is perhaps most forcefully proven by the fact that Walpole’s name appears on no less than 64 subscription lists in the period.\(^{186}\)

Walpole’s subscription to five copies of Barber’s *Poems* is more difficult to interpret; especially given Barber’s connection to Swift and her arrest in 1734 for her part in smuggling over Swift’s seditious poems (see Chapter 5). Budd has suggested that it was ‘the dazzling list of subscribers which ultimately shamed Walpole into subscribing.’\(^{187}\) However, while such generosity could be said to reflect the moneyed men and projecting spirit of the new Whig administration, it is difficult to believe that Walpole was shamed into anything during this period, least of all supporting an Irish draper’s wife.\(^{188}\) That Barber was not seen as a political writer might have made subscription to her volume easier. Her verse shows that she considered poetry (on paper at least) was blind to party faction. In ‘To a Gentleman, who had


\(^{187}\) Budd, ‘Merit in Distress’, 219.

\(^{188}\) Swift, *Corr.* 3: 328.
abused Waller’ (1732), Barber makes clear the absence of distinction between political sides, announcing that the poetic Muse is blind to political factions:

Tho’ in your Principles you glory,
The Muses are not Whig or Tory:
So from your Sentence they appeal,
Nor will be judg’d by Party Zeal.  

And in ‘An Invitation to Edward Walpole, Esq; upon hearing that he was landed in Dublin’, Barber makes clear her dissociation from politics and preferment:

I expect not a Place, nor hope for a Pension.
The love of the Muse is my only Pretension,
I hate to abuse — and I never can flatter;
I write for no Party, nor either bespatter.

This poem also indicates a tangible link between Barber and the Walpole family. The poem is dedicated to Edward Walpole, Robert Walpole’s son, who visited his good friend, Matthew Pilkington in Dublin in 1732, the same time that Barber had returned there to finish her subscription. Barber exploited both Pilkington’s connection and the occasion of Edward’s visit to address the ‘prime minister’s’ son in verse. This poem also points to mutual friendships between Barber and Edward Walpole in England: ‘Yet a Way to engage you I think I have hit on: / I mean, to remember our Friends in Great-Britain.’

Barber also highlights a familial connection between Edward Walpole and his aunt, Charlotte Lady Conway — notable in this context as sister to Catherine Shorter (1682–1737), wife of Robert Walpole: ‘The first Glass shall welcome you, Sir, to our Coast; / And dear Lady Conway shall be my next Toast.’

---

189 Barber, Poems, 80.
190 Barber, Poems, 196.
191 I use the term ‘prime minister’ loosely here as the term did not yet exist in eighteenth-century England.
192 Barber, Poems, 196.
193 Barber, Poems, 196.
Poems. A further letter from Mrs. Russell to Mrs. Clayton (Lady Sundon) at Bath on 18 October 1731 reveals that Barber regularly visited Lady Conway: ‘I find (Mrs. Barber) is to be very much at Mrs. Page and Lady Conway’s.’ Barber also dedicated a poem ‘To the Right Honourable Lady Charlotte Conway, on her resolving to leave Bath’: ‘O Charlotte, truly pious, early wise! / The Pleasure sought by others, you despise.’ This poem is positioned just before Barber’s poem to Edward Walpole in her Poems. If Robert Walpole had subscribed through the Lady Conway–Edward Walpole connection, it would mean that he had subscribed before Barber’s arrest, which is plausible.

Barber’s success in encouraging both Tory and Whig to subscribe to her Poems is testament to her skill and ambition. It shows that Barber could walk a political tightrope adeptly – but more importantly how a woman poet could penetrate the political sphere without being a political tool.

The Caroline Letters Affair 1731

The affair of the Caroline Letters had potentially disastrous consequences for Barber in England. In June 1731, two letters extravagantly praising Barber as ‘the best female poet of this, or perhaps of any age’ were sent to the Queen, one under Swift’s signature and another unsigned but attributed to Swift. A third letter was written ‘in abuse’ of the Queen’s favourite and lady to the bedchamber, Mrs. Charlotte Clayton. The letter to the Queen made a

194 Lady Conway was the granddaughter of Sir John Shorter, Lord Mayor of London and wife of Francis Seymour Conway, who was raised to first Baron Conway (1679-1732) of Kiltullagh, Antrim, in 1712, being member of the Irish Privy Council and Governor of Carrickfergus. Lady Charlotte Conway was sister of Catherine Shorter, first wife of Sir Robert Walpole and mother of Edward Walpole, making her Edward Walpole’s aunt. William C. Lowe, ‘Conway, Francis Seymour’, first marquess of Hertford (1718–1794),” in ODNB, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/6121.
196 Barber, Poems, 195.
197 Only one of these letters, the one signed by Swift, is extant. It was forwarded to Swift via Pope, who received it from Mrs. Howard, who became the Countess of Suffolk at the time of this letter. The forwarding letter from Pope to Swift is also unrecovered. See David Woolley’s discussion of, ‘Swift to H.M. Queen Caroline’, in Swift, Corr. 3: 402.
It further proclaimed that Mrs. Barber ‘is known to Lady Hartford, Lady Torrington, Lady Walpole &c. a woman whose genius is honoured by every man of genius in this Kingdom, and either honoured or envy’d by every man of genius in England’. Especially inflammatory was the bald comparison drawn between Barber the poet and Caroline’s majesty: ‘I will be bold to Say, not less so in her Sphere, than your majesty in yours.’ Henrietta Howard, Countess of Suffolk, being eyewitness to the letters to the Queen and Mrs. Clayton, obtained the letter signed in Swift’s name from the Queen, and gave it to Pope, who in July, sent it to his friend. Samuel Johnson recorded the event: ‘A Letter was sent her, not so much entreating as requiring her patronage of Mrs. Barber, an ingenious Irishwoman, who was then begging subscriptions for her Poems. To this Letter was subscribed the name of Swift, and it has all the appearances of his diction and sentiments; but it was not written in his hand, and had some little improprieties.’

This affair had real potential to sever relations between Barber and Swift. Charlotte Clayton (Lady Sundon) noted that it ‘brought a great deal of odium upon [Swift].’ Writing to Charlotte Clayton, Dr. Delany lamented: ‘She hath to my knowledge entirely lost Swift’s friendship and all hope of yours.’ It was unthinkable that Swift, who for a number of years had nursed, and not silently, a deep-seated grievance against Queen Caroline, should address a letter to her. As Samuel Johnson later noted in his Life of Swift (1781), Swift had been treated with some distinction by Caroline when she was a Princess, and was well received by her in
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199 Woolley has observed that although the original date-line was inscribed 22 June 1735, Swift wrote, ‘or one’ in the margin. The letter is now accepted and repositioned in Swift’s Correspondence under the date 22 June 1731. This date also corresponds with Swift’s letters to Pope and Suffolk about the affair. Swift, Corr. 3: 400-403.
203 Llanover, The Autobiography and Correspondence of Mary Delany, 1: 321-323
her exaltation; but whether she gave hopes which she never took care to satisfy, or he formed expectations that she never meant to raise, the event was, that he always afterwards looked on her with malevolence, and particularly charged her with breaking her promise of some medals which she engaged to send him.\(^\text{204}\)

In a letter to Pope, Swift minimised his acquaintance with Barber: ‘to have so much zeal for one almost a Stranger, and to make such a description of a woman as to prefer her before all man kind, and to instance it as one of the greatest grievances of Irel[an]d, that her M[ajesty] hath not encouraged Mrs B[arber] a woollen-drapers wife, declined in the world, because she hath a knack at versifying’, and indicated that the forgery, if taken seriously, represented ‘a folly so transcendent that no man could be guilty of who was not fit for Bedlam.’\(^\text{205}\) A week later, Swift wrote to the Countess of Suffolk to exculpate him with the Queen: ‘I am told there were three letters sent to Her Majesty in relation to one Mrs Barber; who is now in London, and soliciting for a Subscription to her poems. It seems, the Queen thinks that those letters were written by me; and, I scorn to defend myself even to Her Majesty; grounding my scorn upon the Opinion I had of her justice, her taste, and good sense’.\(^\text{206}\)

At first glance, it appears plausible that Barber decided to forge Swift’s signature and write her own testimonial to the queen as if it were a letter from Swift. Barber was acting on Swift’s instructions to tell the Countess of Suffolk that he would apply to the Queen in person if he were in England. When Barber was prevented from approaching Suffolk by Charlotte Clayton, Barber quickly penned another letter abusing, Clayton for blocking her access. It is unlikely, that Barber forged the letter to Caroline. Barber’s ‘Combat between her Modesty and Ambition’ was not so great as to risk her patronage relationship with Swift. More conclusively, Delany, who was in London the following February, asserted that Barber was

---

\(^\text{204}\) *Samuel Johnson: The Lives of the Poets*, 3: 204.


innocent of the forgery even if she had sent an angry missive to Mrs. Clayton. Delany wrote as much to Mrs. Clayton on 27 February 1732: ‘As to Dr. Swift, I shall content myself to tell you I know her to be innocent; but, as to you, I shall not attempt to acquit her, let the imputation rest upon her with all its weight. It is for that reason, and under that very circumstance, I claim your protection for her.’

It is unlikely that Delany, despite his patronage of Barber, would write so forcefully on her account if he was suspicious of Barber’s culpability. It was less likely that he would request Clayton’s protection for Barber. As he noted: ‘In doing this I have risked the honour of your acquaintance and give me leave to say, I know the value of what I risk.’ Writing to Suffolk from Bath four months later, Charlotte Clayton had formed her opinion of Barber as ‘a strange, bold, disagreeable woman’. Delany’s impassioned plea continued: ‘I had vindicated Mrs. Barber’s innocence, and treated her supposed calumny as monstrous and incredible, and laid before you, in the fullest light, the merit of supporting a woman of so much worth, whose least praise was writing (in the intervals of business) a volume of excellent poems.’ He further added: ‘Give me leave to add this short postscript, to assure you, that no mortal knows of this letter, or ever shall from me, treat it as you will.’

It is important that Delany wrote the letter of his own volition. It demonstrated that he had nothing to gain from supporting Barber, which undoubtedly helped prove Barber’s innocence to the satisfaction of Charlotte Clayton, who generously responded with a subscription to seven copies of Barber’s Poems.

If Barber did not forge Swift’s hand, then who did? Woolley suggests the possibility of a woman courtier. A clumsy well-wisher, or court meddler is possible. In a letter to Swift on 5 June 1731, Lady Elizabeth Germain observed: ‘I have not been in a way of seeing

207 Dr. Delany to Mrs. Clayton 27 February 1731-2. Llanover, The Autobiography and Correspondence of Mary Delany, 1: 321-323. Delany’s letter to Mrs. Clayton, afterwards Lady Sundon, which appeared in her Memoirs, was undated, but as the Caroline letters were sent in the summer of 1731, it is probably the case that Delany’s letter was written the following February 1732. This would also account for the delay in Barber’s return to Ireland. A.T. Thompson, ed., The Memoirs of Viscountess Sundon, 1: 68.
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Mrs Barber this great while, but I hear & I hope 'tis, that she goes on in her Subscription very well, nor has the Lady she so much feared done her any harm, if she endeavoured it, which is more than I know she did.\(^{210}\) However, I agree with Ehrenpreis who observes: ‘it is hard to believe that anyone who hoped simply to aid Mrs Barber or to trouble Swift would have concocted so transparent a bluff.’\(^{211}\) For this reason, it is worth considering the Countess of Suffolk’s involvement. To explain this fully, we need to look at Henrietta Howard’s role as courtier and her relationship to Swift. Before she became publicly known as the King’s mistress, Howard was generally admired and trusted for her quiet reserve — partly due to the deafness from which she suffered.\(^{212}\) Swift and Howard had been friends since 1725 which resulted in a series of informal letters from Swift in Dublin. She was a central figure in Swift’s new relations with the new Court. However, relations between Swift and Suffolk were soured following the disappointment of Gay’s hopes of a decent post at Court. Both Gay and Pope exonerated her; however, Swift, thought Howard had deceived Gay into believing that she could be of assistance. Doubtless this has something to do with Swift’s personal dissatisfaction at being on the fringes of court life as much as his loyalty to Gay. Yet, his mistrust was further compounded by Howard’s new ‘role’ as mistress to King George and subsequent elevation to the title, Countess of Suffolk. Swift wrote as much when he charged Suffolk with ‘acting too much like a Courtier.’ Howard was incensed by Swift’s suggestion that she had changed, and particularly Swift’s patronising tone: ‘I am content that you should tell the Queen all that I have said of her, and in my own words, if you please.’ Her reply to Swift clearly stated her anger: ‘You seem to think that you have a Natural Right to Abuse me because I am a Woman, and a Courtier.’\(^{213}\) This letter also suggests the possibility of Suffolk’s involvement in the forgery. She continued: ‘I have taken it as a Woman and a

\(^{210}\) Swift Corr. 3: 399.

\(^{211}\) Ehrenpreis, Swift, 3: 703.


\(^{213}\) Swift, Corr. 3: 434.
Courtier ought: with great resentment; and a determin’d resolution of Revenge. The Number of letters that has been sent and thought by many to be Yours (and thank God they were all Silly ones) has been a fair Field to execute it. Ehrenpreis has observed, ‘Swift’s letter to Lady Suffolk has so many parallels with the forgery that it could have been the mould for it. It is possible that Suffolk in a fit of pique decided to take to heart Swift’s instructions (to ‘tell the Queen all that I have said’). Suffolk even went so far as to teasingly suggest that Swift was under ‘Suspecions [sic] of having a violent Passion for Mrs Barber.’ Suffolk was clearly pleased that she, once vilified as the King’s mistress, now had the upper hand to assist Swift out of an embarrassing, and potentially difficult, situation.

For Swift, the insinuation that his relationship to Barber was anything other than professional was deeply uncomfortable. As Barnett notes, ‘the need to defend himself to the Countess must have been distasteful to Swift since he had reached the harsh conclusion that she was merely a courtier, incapable of the friendship he had once imagined possible.’ More distressingly, now the ‘Silly Woman’ (Barber) whom he supported and ‘The Courtier’ (Suffolk) were inextricably linked to his name. Swift’s reply to Suffolk defended himself against the allegation of any potential indecency and attempted to quench any further sparks of controversy: ‘Some parts of your letter I do not understand. Mrs Barber was recommended to me by Doctor Delany, who is now in London, and whom I once presented to You at Marble Hill. She seems to be a woman of piety, and a poetical Genius and though I never visited her in my life, yet was I disposed to do her good offices on the Doctor’s account; and her own good character.’ Swift, also eager to explicate the situation to Pope, quickly minimised his involvement with Mary Barber, and instead, acknowledged Patrick Delany as Barber’s recognised ‘Protector’: ‘I will tell you sincerely how the affair stands. I never was at
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215 Ehrenpreis, Swift, 3: 703.
Mrs Bar[ber]s house, in my life, except once that I chanced by her shop, was desired to walk
in and went no farthr- nor stayed three minutes. Dr. Delany hath long been her Protector, and
he being many years my acquaintance, desired my good offices for her, & brought her several
times to the Deanery.¹²¹ Swift’s denial of Barber appears cowardly here. Samuel Johnson:
‘When [Swift] was charged with this Letter, he laid hold of the inaccuracies, and urged the
improbability of the accusation; but never denied it: he shuffles between cowardice and
veracity, and talks big when he says nothing.’²²⁰ At the time, this affair underlines how
potentially damaging such implications were to Barber’s public image. Of course both Pope
and Swift knew that Swift was one of Barber’s patrons – more than just a passing visit to the
deanery or her shop. Just two years previously, in 1729, Swift had written to Pope about his
‘Triumfeminate’ with Barber as its ‘chief Poetess’.

Fortunately for Barber, Swift believed Delany’s protestations of Barber’s innocence.
He continued to assist Barber’s subscription efforts and write letters on her behalf for the next
two years. More telling, is his relationship with Suffolk, which was abruptly severed
following this incident. That Swift ceased his correspondence with Lady Suffolk (who is also
notably absent on Barber’s list) suggests that Swift had his suspicions of Howard’s
involvement. Later, in 1734, Barber wrote to Swift, observing Suffolk’s dismissal from
Court, adding that she should have subscribed to her Poems: ‘This affair is much talk’d of yet
I have not met with one person who say they have lost a friend at Court by her going. I
suppose now her Ladyship wou’d not be sorry if she had done her self the honour to have
regarded your request & subscrib’d to me.’²²¹ Barber’s letter to Swift expressed smug
satisfaction, but in 1731 the affair of the Caroline Letters had a potentially disastrous effect
on Barber’s subscription. Fortunately she had been vindicated to her patron Swift, and luckily
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although the letters did not effectively elicit ‘the best Privilege of Crowns’, they did not injure Barber’s general reputation or her relationship with prominent patrons.

Swift was involved in every aspect of Barber’s subscription. He solicited support in London, engaging women who proved especially important in accessing polite society. Fortunately for Barber, his presence did not prevent subscribers from both political sides; however, Barber was continually reminded that subscription-seeking needed to be approached delicately and carefully. Rupert’s bungling of the linen contract complicated Barber’s subscription efforts and made it more pressing that she succeed, while the Caroline Letters Affair proved a potentially disastrous episode that could have ended her publication prospects and her patronage relationship with Swift. That Barber managed to navigate these incidents and solicit subscriptions from aristocratic women, peers, politicians and Scriblerians alike is testament to her considerable achievement during this time.

Barber’s subscription in Dublin

Following two highly charged, but ultimately successful, years pursuing subscriptions in London, Barber returned to Dublin with Dr. Delany and his wife, Mrs. Tennison.\(^{222}\) Barber did not intend to stay in Dublin; her plan was to close her subscription and relocate her family to England. On 6 September 1732 Mary Pendarves (who had come to Ireland in 1731) wrote to her sister, Ann Granville, with the news that ‘Mrs. Barber is come to Ireland they say in order to transplant her family in England.’\(^{223}\) That winter, Barber requested Swift to write to Alderman Barber (no relation) in London to arrange a sinecure for her husband, Rupert, so that he too, might have prospects there. However, her speedy return to England was

\(^{222}\) According to the _Dublin Journal_ 7 October 1732, Mrs. Barber was on board the yacht to Ireland with the newlywed Delany, his first wife, Margaret Tennison and her daughter. Delany had married the wealthy widow earlier in June 1732. He would later marry Mary Pendarves in 1741.

\(^{223}\) In another letter to her sister dated 13 August 1732, Mary Pendarves noted: ‘Mrs. Barber’s design of leaving England soon, may be you know already.’ Llanover, _The Autobiography and Correspondence of Mary Delany_, 1: 372, 383.
hampered by repetitive fits of gout which resulted in over a year-long delay. Barber used this
time to consolidate her subscription. Dublin was where Barber had begun writing and
printing poems, and, as might be expected, the city proved a fertile ground for subscriptions.

This final section analyses this achievement of Barber subscription in Dublin. In particular, how her list reflects the enterprising, projecting spirit of the capital at this time. This is all the more remarkable when we compare Barber’s achievement with her contemporary, Matthew Pilkington, and the subscription list to his Poems on Several Occasions (1730) in Dublin three years earlier. The section further demonstrates that Barber expended little energy in pursuing subscriptions in Dublin. This is evident in the relatively fewer poetic dedications to her Dublin subscribers in comparison with those to her subscribers at Tunbridge Wells, Bath and London. The poems Barber penned during this time have less to do with the subscription process. Nonetheless, these poems are important as they reflect the strong network between Dublin and London during this period. Finally, I examine Barber’s efforts to solicit Alderman Barber in London. In contrast with the enthusiasm of her Dublin subscribers, Alderman Barber’s support required negotiation and perseverance. Two years after embarking on her subscription, the business of getting support in England remained a complex process.

In her Preface, Barber writes: ‘When I mention the Favours I met with from Strangers, I should be very ungrateful if I did not acknowledge, that I have also been highly obliged to many Persons of the greatest Merit in Ireland.’ Unsurprisingly, almost half of Barber’s subscribers came from Dublin, and its surrounds, or lived there during her subscription. Eighteenth-century, Dublin was quickly expanding into a cosmopolitan city, with two houses of parliament, a substantial civil service, various military headquarters, coffee houses and schools, an expanding university, law courts, a port and scores of small
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industries and shops. Of course, this world was small in proportion to the entire population, and broadly defined by the relationship of the established church, politics, and loyalty to the English administration. However, it was this sphere which controlled and influenced Dublin at this time. And it was this circle from which Barber gathered further support for her *Poems*.

Barber had little trouble procuring sponsorship in the close-knit, accessible society of Dublin. Most of the names on Barber’s subscription list were already secured through her involvement in the Delany and Swift’s literary circle before she left for England in 1730. These included Barber’s patrons, Lord and Lady Carteret, their secretary Thomas Tickell and his wife; Thomas Sheridan; Delany’s friend, Dr. Richard Helsham, and John Putland. Delany’s wife, Mrs Tennison, subscribed for a generous ten books, and her daughter, Miss Tennison, for a further two copies. Swift was probably responsible for the subscriptions of Mrs Mary Harrison, daughter of Martha Whiteaway, and Mrs. Worrall, wife of John Worrall. The circle’s literary critic, Elizabeth Sican and her husband also agreed to a copy each. Significantly, Barber managed to procure support from outside the confines of the city. Both Bluestocking literary hostess, Elizabeth Vesey (1715-1791) who resided at Lucan House, and the reclusive, Lady Elizabeth Echlin, from Rush, County Dublin signed for a copy of Barber’s *Poems*. Echlin would later gain notoriety for her correspondence with Samuel Richardson, but at this time, she had only peripheral contact with literary figures in the Dublin social scene. Further subscriptions demonstrated Barber’s connections in Dublin’s bookselling and printing professions. Constantia Grierson’s husband, George Abraham Grierson, likely introduced Barber to this network which included Thomas Bacon, bookseller,
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printer, and publisher in Essex Street who founded the *Dublin Mercury*, and became printer of the official newspaper, the *Dublin Gazette* in 1742.\footnote{Robert Munter, *A Dictionary of the Print Trade in Ireland 1550-1775* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1988), 18-19.} Bacon would later gain notoriety for his involvement in a factional dispute over the publishing of Richardson’s *Pamela*.\footnote{To compete with Faulkner’s pirated edition, Richardson sent Bacon sheets for the third and fourth volumes, which the latter sold at a lower rate. This led to accusations of an attempt to destroy the Dublin press.}

Another notable subscriber is Richard Malone, a printer in Skinner Row, who had been appointed King’s Printer in Ireland in 1690. And George Faulkner, Swift’s celebrated Irish printer. Barber’s split with Matthew and Laetitia Pilkington in 1734 means that the names of both Pilkingtons are conspicuously absent (see Chapter 5). However, Laetitia’s father, Dr. Van Lewen, subscribed for a copy. Another notable absentee from Barber’s list is her supporter and friend, Constantia Grierson, who died in the winter of 1732.

Predictably, Barber had strong support from the Protestant Dublin clergy. These subscriptions were largely gathered under the aegis of Swift and Delany, as in the case of John Hoadly, Archbishop of Dublin and George Berkeley. Two members of the Gratton family — Reverend John ‘Jack’ Gratton (ca.1680–1754) perpetual curate of St. Nicholas Within and older brother James Gratton, M.D. (ca.1673–1747) — also supported Barber’s *Poems*. Both men were favourites of Swift, who in 1737 named them among the executors under his will.\footnote{Swift, Corr. 4: 60.} Swift was also a regular correspondent of Barber’s subscriber Rev. James Stopford (c.1697–1759). Swift assisted in Stopford’s promotion within the church and appointed him as one of his executors, bequeathing him a Van Dyck portrait of Charles I, which Stopford himself had originally given to Swift.\footnote{Swift, Corr. 3:75.} Swift introduced him to important friends such as Carteret and Pope. In a letter to Swift on 17 February 1726, Pope wrote: ‘Mr. Stopford will be the bearer of this letter, for whose acquaintance I am, among many other
favours, obliged to you."\textsuperscript{231}

For a woman poet by subscription, support from the clergy gave credence and weight. In Barber’s case, support from the Dublin clergy also signified backing from a powerful group in Anglo-Irish society. The Dublin clergy was very much part of the political and patronage fabric of the city. Protestants accounted for roughly half of the recorded population of Dublin city in 1732, and a typical member of genteel Irish society was also a member of the established Church of Ireland. The clergy was part of the patronage system in Dublin, reflected in the accumulation of wealth, favours and church benefices throughout the country. One notable example on Barber’s list was Dr. Robert Clayton (1695–1758), Bishop of Killala and Achonry (1729–1730) and Bishop of Cork and Ross 1735. Clayton hungrily sought preferment in the church, although it is widely believed that his success owed more to his courtship of his cousin Mrs Charlotte Clayton (Later Lady Sundon), the favourite of Queen Caroline, than any personal merit. His marriage to Catherine Donnellan in 1728 further connected him to the important Donnellan-Percival clan in Dublin and London.\textsuperscript{232} Mary Pendarves, who stayed with the couple on her arrival in Dublin, described Clayyton’s new house, 80 St. Stephen’s Green, thus: ‘The apartments are handsome, and furnished with gold coloured damask – virtue and busts, and pictures that the Bishop brought with him from Italy. They keep a very handsome table, six dishes of meat are constantly at dinner, and six plates at supper.’\textsuperscript{233} Barber dedication, ‘An Apology to Dr Clayton, Bishop of Killala, and his Lady, who had promis’d to dine with the Author’, celebrated Clayton’s marriage to Catherine, under the name ‘Delia’: ‘Yet you’ve a fair Prospect, it must be confess’d / Who, with Fortune, and Station, and Delia are bless’d’.\textsuperscript{234} Clayton subscribed for one copy of Barber’s Poems and his wife Catherine subscribed for seven.

\textsuperscript{231} Swift, Corr. 3: 75.
\textsuperscript{233} Llanover, The Autobiography and Correspondence of Mary Delany, 1: 288.
\textsuperscript{234} Barber, Poems, 93.
Dublin clergymen were also an integral part of the intellectual sphere. Clerical subscribers on Barber’s list are defined by their association with Trinity College, Dublin. In the eighteenth century, Trinity was a progressive college with a strong spirit of improvement and public spirit. Along with their firm reputation for philosophy, science and literature, these college clerics also provided the stimulus, and the leadership for corporate efforts to improve social conditions and promote economic development throughout the country as a whole. Samuel Madden (1686–1765), who subscribed for an impressive ten copies of Barber’s Poems, was a notable figure in this respect. A native of Ireland and a close friend of Swift, Madden was famous for his enterprising energy and philanthropic nature. His Reflections and Resolutions Proper for the Gentlemen of Ireland (Dublin, 1738), set up new standards for the landlord class and reflects the public spirit of the time as seen in his friend George Berkeley’s The Querist (1735–7), and Swift’s earlier Short View of the State of Ireland (1727). His scheme for promoting learning and improvement at Trinity College, Dublin, by which premiums (sum of money) were granted to those graduates who answered best at the quarterly examinations earned him the sobriquet ‘Premium’ Madden, but his enterprising spirit did not stop there. Madden also gave awards out of his own pocket for useful inventions in industry, agriculture, under the auspices of The Dublin Society of which he was one of the first patrons. This society, founded in 1731 to promote agriculture, manufacturers and the useful arts was by far one of the most important corporate undertakings. The Society, which attracted the involvement of Patrick Delany, Thomas
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235 The association with TCD is indicated on Barber’s list by the titles: ‘F.T.C.D’ (Fellow of Trinity College Dublin) and ‘S.F.T.C.D’ (Senior Fellow of Trinity College Dublin).
237 In 1730, Madden submitted a plan to Trinity College Dublin for the encouragement of learning which involved the establishment of premiums or grants of no less than £230, which he proposed to raise by subscription and taxing undergraduates. Madden contributed a generous £600 himself, and his scheme, with some modifications, was adopted by the university. This grant was first applied to academic learning in Trinity College, and later to agricultural achievement in the country at large, through the Dublin Society, was no more than the idea of giving prizes, but Madden is said to have invented it, and, more to the point, he gave the agricultural prized at first out of his own pocket. See Terence de Vere White, The Story of the Royal Dublin Society (Tralee: The Kerryman, 1955).
Sheridan, and George Faulkner, reflected a widespread conviction that something must be done to improve the Irish economy. It was among the first institutions of its kind in Europe, and proved to be one of the most successful. Madden’s enterprising spirit and that of his colleagues in the Dublin Society sharply contrast with the apathy of the clergy at Tunbridge Wells and Bath.

For Barber, support from clergy on her subscription list was a significant achievement. The majority of these names were solicited through Swift or Delany; nonetheless this sphere represented an important characteristic in Anglo-Irish society. Clergy in Dublin were wealthy, influential, intellectual and progressive. In short, an ideal source of support for any subscription-writer.

If support from the literary circle and clerical sphere for Barber’s Poems was predictable, her strength in gathering subscriptions from the commercial sector of Dublin city was equally impressive. Barber’s subscription list reflects the growing commercial sphere and boasts some of the most important names in the city at this time. Many of these subscriptions were probably gathered at the Barber’s Capel Street shop (which was just two streets away from Delany’s Stafford Street home and adjacent to the fashionable Henrietta Street and Rutland Square on Dublin’s northside (both near Barber’s Capel Street residence)). Notable figures include the wealthy landowner and politician, the Honourable William Conolly and his wife Lady Luisa Conolly; successful Dublin merchants, Alexander and Daniel Conyngham, prominent Dublin bankers Arthur and Rowly Hill, and Nathaniel Clements; and architect Edward Lovett Pearce. They were well-known in the city and being men of family and position were respected by the public. More importantly, these subscribers are a reminder that there was no insuperable barrier to prevent a poor Protestant from climbing the social ladder. This was an essential characteristic of ascendancy. The true
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238 While many subscriptions from Irish peers were obtained in England, Dublin was also the home of many visiting and resident aristocrats including the Earl of Kingston, the Earl of Thomond, the Earl of Blessington and Viscount Mountjoy, all of whom subscribed to Barber’s volume.
character of Anglo-Irish life rested in the middle ranks of society, among merchants and professional men, whose influence in the world depended on ability and initiative rather than wealth. Speaker Conolly’s career is a particularly useful reminder that even in the aristocratic eighteenth century the road to power and wealth was open to men of ability as well as to men of birth. Conolly, who came from Leixlip, Co. Kildare, was a self-made man who became Speaker of the Irish Commons and ten times Lord Justice. When Castletown House was built Conolly was reputedly the richest landowner in Ireland. Conolly’s protégé, Edward Lovett Pierce (1699–1733), who is most famous for his design of the Houses of Parliament in Dublin also subscribed. Luke Gardiner, a banker along with the title of Surveyor-General of Customs and Vice-Treasurer in Ireland was a prominent Dublin subscriber. A native of Dublin city, and from humble beginnings, of which little is known, Gardiner became the founder of the family fortune; his combined career as banker, public servant enjoying high office, and speculative property developer made him an influential figure in the civic politics and in the development of Dublin. From early in the century until 1738 he owned a bank in Castle St. with his junior partner Arthur Hill-Trevor (c.1694–1771), later Viscount Dungannon. By 1717 he was living on Cork Hill, on Lombard Street, Gardiner joined forces with Arthur Hill to open another bank. Gardiner was the original impetus for the new wave of urban planning; his vision probably influenced the wide streets commissioners when by the end of the century the breadth of Sackville St. was extended to the River Liffey. Nathaniel Clements (1705–1777) well-known in political and Court circles in London, and a household name in official, parliamentary, military, banking, property, architectural and fashionable

circles in Ireland.\textsuperscript{243} He owed much of his achievement to the influence of his distant relation, Luke Gardiner, with whom he cooperated in building the grand residential quarter of Henrietta St. Dublin, in the early 1730s.\textsuperscript{244} For almost fifty years Clements was the dominant and influential figure in Irish financial administration.

\begin{figure}
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\caption{James Malton, ‘Capel Street with the Royal Exchange’ (1799)\textsuperscript{243}}
\end{figure}

\textbf{Assessing Barber’s achievement in Dublin}

George Faulkner held a dim view of Dublin’s subscribing public: ‘You know that Dublin is the poorest place in the world for subscriptions to Books. It is much easier to get a hundred dinners, with as many dozen bottles of claret, than a single guinea for the best author; few or not people here caring to subscribe, and reading not being the prevailing taste.’\textsuperscript{246} For Barber the consolidation of her subscription in Dublin was a triumph, and it was probably her subscription experience in England that prepared her to collect support. A brief

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{244} James Quinn, ‘Nathaniel Clements,’ in \textit{DIB}, http://dib.cambridge.org/viewReadPage.do?articleId=a1736.
\textsuperscript{246} Maxwell, \textit{Dublin and the Georges}, 199.
\end{flushright}
comparison of Barber’s subscription list with that of Matthew Pilkington’s *Poems on Several Occasions* (1730), puts her achievement into context. Pilkington’s list, which spanned eight pages of names, does not reflect the Dublin of Barber’s list. This is surprising, especially as Pilkington had the support of Swift and Delany in the city. However, despite being a Trinity College graduate and a clergyman, few of his clerical peers subscribed. While members of the Dublin literary circle supported his volume, Pilkington did not garner much support from commercial or administrative quarters. The names of Luke Gardiner, Arthur Hill, John Putland, Speaker Conolly, and Edward Lovett Pearce, are all notably absent from Pilkington’s list. Of course, with a church benefice, Pilkington had perhaps less interest in making his subscription work financially. However, as Barber’s literary contemporary in the city, it is a useful comparison which serves to underline the ambitious achievement of Barber’s project.

Despite the impressive gathering of a cross-section of Dublin society on her list, Barber expended little personal energy in seeking out support in Dublin. This in part owed much to Delany and Swift’s support in the city, but even more to Barber’s desire to return to England to print her *Poems* and relocate her family. That few poems were dedicated to Dublin residents/subscribers corroborates this view. The poems that were penned during this time were to English visitors who had come to Dublin on administrative business or on holiday. Barber’s return to Dublin coincided with the visits of several of her English acquaintances and subscribers. This may have been more than a coincidence. Mary Pendarves (in Dublin since the previous year) dined with John Wainwright, appointed one of the Barons of the Exchequer, who had taken up office in Dublin in 1732: ‘To-morrow the Hamiltons are to be with us, and on Saturday we dine at Baron Wainwrights.’ Wainwright (1657–1741) was an important social figure. A close friend and correspondent of Charlotte Clayton,
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Viscountess Sundon, Wainwright recommended George Berkeley to Mrs Clayton for patronage. He was also on cordial terms with the Duke of Dorset and assisted George Bubb Doddington when Doddington came to Ireland in 1733. While still in London, Mary Barber wrote a poem on the occasion of her appointment to dine with Wainwright, which had failed to transpire: ‘Written at Camberwell, near London, in the Study of Mr. Wainwright, now Baron of the Exchequer in Ireland, where the Author accidentally din’d alone’: ‘In vain you call on me To-day; / Here Wainwright only I obey.’ Doubtless Barber thought it more advantageous to return to Dublin, than exhaust herself penning poems to absentees in London. Edward Walpole, son of Sir Robert Walpole, mentioned earlier in relation to his father’s subscription, had also arrived in Dublin sometime between 1732 and 1733. The young Walpole became friends with Matthew Pilkington, who undoubtedly saw the connection as a means for further preferment.

Mary Pendarves, the most significant point of intersection between London and Dublin circles, was also initiated into the Dublin scene. Pendarves who spent eighteen months touring the country and visiting friends, quickly established herself in premier social circles in Dublin which included the viceregal court, various genteel gatherings and the literary and clerical sphere of Trinity College Dublin. She stayed with the wealthy and well-connected Bishop Clayton and socialised with the Percival and Usher families. Through

248 Writing to Charlotte Clayton from Dublin 29 February 1732, Wainwright noted: ‘I heard the Bishop [Robert Clayton] preach to-day, and was so much pleased, that I wished you had been one of the audience.’ Thomson, Memoirs of the Viscountess Sundon, 2: 90.
249 In a letter to Mrs. Clayton, Wainwright noted his invitation from Dorset to Knowle house: ‘I excused myself to the Duke of Dorset in a letter from hence for not going to Knowle, by saying, I thought the greatest respect I could pay his Grace was by a speedy and diligent attendance in my post, and I have endeavoured to make it good.’ On 19 November 1733 Wainwright recorded his introduction to Doddington: ‘Soon after Mr Doddington came here, it was signified to me it would be acceptable to his Royal Hig[hness] if I did him any service in my power ... I flatter myself I have been of some little use to him.’ See Thomson, Memoirs of the Viscountess Sundon, 2: 91, 277.
250 According to Pendarves’s correspondence with her sister Anne: ‘The Bishop of Killala and his lady and Mr. Donnellan have wrote very kind pressing letters for us, and there is an apartment ready for us in the Bishop’s house whenever we please to go and take possession.’ Pendarves also socialised with the Percival family who had recently returned to Dublin: On 25 November 1731 she notes: ‘Sunday to church we went – staid at home
her connection with the Claytons with whom she stayed in St. Stephen’s Green, Pendarves became intimate with a cross-section of Dublin society. According to Pendarves, Mrs. Clayton ‘promised to admit her friends every Wednesday.’ The regulars included the Usher family and the Claytons (Bishop Clayton and his wife Catherine – sister to Anne Donnellan), who subscribed to Barber’s Poems. Some lesser-known subscribers to Barber’s volume also appear in Mary Pendarves’s correspondence during this time, including: Mrs. Elizabeth Forth, Miss Burton, Mrs. Campbell Hamilton, Mrs. Hannah Clements, Mrs. Elizabeth Clements and Mrs Palmer. Pendarves also joined Patrick Delany and Swift’s literary circle which included Constantia Grierson, Elizabeth Sican and Laetitia Pilkington: ‘I have just begun an acquaintance among the wits — Mrs. Grierson, Mrs. Sycon [sic], and Mrs. Pilkington; the latter is a bosom friend of Dean Swift’s, and I hope among them I shall be able to pick up some entertainment for you.’ Pendarves brought with her Anne Donnellan and Frances Arabella-Kelly. Pendarves wrote on Delany’s Thursday meetings: ‘On Thursday Phill and I dined at Dr. Delany’s; there we met Miss Kelly, Lord Orrery, the Dean of St. Patrick’s, Mr. Kit Donnellan, Dr. Helsham — a very ingenious entertaining man. In such company you may believe time passed away very pleasantly.’ ‘We are initiated of that}
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253 Llanover, The Autobiography and Correspondence of Mary Delany, 1: 273, 316.
254 ‘Miss Betty Forth, has more sense than comes to her share, but withall so fantastical, that ’tis not easy to describe her; she has a great deal of wit, but she must like her company prodigiously when she bestows any of it on them, unless she is angered, and then nothing ever was so keen.’ ‘I esteem Mrs. Hamilton as a woman of excellent sense and conduct and I would (were I under her circumstance of life) place her as my pattern, I like her company extremely; she is easy unaffected, has read a good deal, and her memory serves her very well on all occasions.’
255 Llanover, The Autobiography and Correspondence of Mary Delany, 1: 301.
256 Writing to her sister from Chester on 10 September 1731, Pendarves gives an account of their journey to Ireland which, although involved much waiting due to the weather, was entertaining: ‘We have several of our acquaintances here waiting for a passage also. Mr. Dubourg and his wife, with his charming Fidelle, sweet Philomel, whose conversation, you know, is not inferior to her voice, exerts herself and is a great traveller… Mr Gore, son to Judge Gore, of Ireland, and heir to a great estate.’
witty club, and Thursday is the day of meeting.²⁵⁷ Donnellan, Barber and Pendarves were joined by Frances-Arabella Kelly and Letitia Bushe. Kelly, daughter of the Jacobite Denis Kelly, and granddaughter of Charles O’Kelly, historian of the Jacobite War in Ireland, may well have been a distant connection of the Donnellan family. Kelly was also famous for her beauty in Dublin and admired by Swift.²⁵⁸ Kelly subscribed to both Matthew Pilkington’s *Poems on Several Occasions* (Dublin, 1730), Barber’s *Poems* and to Faulkner’s edition of Swift’s *Works*. Letitia Bushe (c.1705-1757) daughter of a minor Irish landowner and one-time office-holder, was a regular member of the intellectual and cultural circle that included Mary Pendarves, Anne-Donnellan, and Robert Clayton.²⁵⁹ She stayed for extended periods at the Delany house, joining in excursions and dinner parties, and sharing with Pendarves a passionate interest in painting and drawing.²⁶⁰ A single woman, of independent but limited means, Bushe spent her time in a succession of extended visits to the houses of friends (including the Delanys), and maintained her position within this circle.²⁶¹ Bushe does not appear in Swift’s correspondence, but as Conolly as noted, this is not surprising: in 1699 her father had earned Swift’s lasting enmity by displacing him as secretary to the earl of Berkeley, then lord justice of Ireland, and later by supposedly accepting a bribe to block his appointment to the deanery of Derry.²⁶² However, Bushe subscribed to Barber’s *Poems*.

*The dedication of Barber’s Poems to John Boyle, fifth Earl of Orrery*

John Boyle, fifth Earl of Orrery also became part of this circle in Dublin. Orrery had

²⁶⁰ Bushe’s chief interest was in painting. There are repeated references to work in both oil and watercolours, including at least two pictures painted for Mrs. Delany’s friend the Duchess of Portland. Llanover, *The Autobiography and Correspondence of Mary Delany*, 2: 505.
²⁶¹ Bushe’s unusually intimate letters reveals a determined individualist, consciously distancing herself from some of the official pieties of her society. A small sample of Bushe’s own letters survive from the period around 1740. Connolly, ‘A Woman’s Life’, 433-451.
arrived in Ireland with Lady Orrery on 4 July 1732 – he spent time between first Cork and then Dublin. His wife Lady Henrietta Hamilton died that August. John Boyle, fifth Earl of Orrery was an aristocrat interested in literature and patronage of the arts. He conveniently represented interest in England and Ireland. He had been a friend of Pope since the 1730s and of Swift since 1732.263 Swift’s earliest mention of Orrery was in his letter to Charles Ford on October 1732: ‘Lord Orrery stays here this winter. I met him at dinners and he hath dined with me. He seems an honest man, and of good disposition.’264 Despite Orrery’s supposed jealousy of Swift’s female wits, the women appear to have enjoyed his company.265 Mary Pendarves was similarly impressed: ‘Lord Orrery is very gentle in his manner, and mighty polite.’266 Barber’s poem ‘To the Right Honourable the Earl of Orrery, on his Promise to sup with me’ written from Capel Street 24 January 1732, observes the relaxed and genial atmosphere of the Dublin circle: ‘For a Boyle and a Swift, will each other regale.’267 Barber had first met with Orrery at Tunbridge Wells in 1731 where she began her subscription, and then again when she returned to Dublin. Barber’s difficulty was how far she could presume upon their previous association and how best to approach Orrery for support. Following her implication in the Caroline Letters forgery, Barber was circumspect in how she approached a potential patron. She looked to Swift to strategise her approach and broker a patronage relationship with the earl. Barber wrote to Swift requesting advice about dedicating her collection to Lord Orrery. Swift wrote to Orrery on her behalf: ‘I lately received a Letter from Mrs. Barber; wherein she desires my Opinion about dedicating her Poems to your Lordship and seems in Pain to know how far she may be allow’d to draw your Character.’268

264 Swift, Corr. 4: 77.
266 Llanover, The Autobiography and Correspondence of Mary Delany, 1: 398-400.
267 Barber, Poems, 172.
268 ‘Swift to the Earl of Orrery’in Mary Barber, Poems, iii-iv. Barber printed the letters in her Poems presumably with Swift’s permission. The letter from Barber to Swift is unrecovered.
According to Swift, Barber had risked sounding boastful by advertising Orrery’s ‘surprizing Instances of Generosity and Favour’ to her, which ‘in her haste she hath been so unfashionable to publish where-ever she goes.’ Barber’s effusive praise of Orrery’s support also left her open to charges of sycophancy and insincerity, which could have negative consequences for the public reception of Barber’s Poems: ‘This makes her apprehend, that all she can say to your Lordship’s Advantage will be interpreted as the mere Effect of Flattery, under the Style and Title of Gratitude’. Swift’s conclusion, ‘upon the most mature Deliberation’, was that ‘the Office of Setting out your Lordship’s Character, will not come properly from her own Pen.’ Instead, he would direct her efforts. This was typical of Swift’s efforts to manage his protégés, but it served to maintain Barber’s modest image. Swift’s list of the clichéd ‘Topicks’ that Barber should omit from her dedication to Orrery included any reference to his learning, genius, affability, generosity, humility, modesty, Christian belief and Orrery’s love of both Ireland and England. ‘I think’, cautioned Swift, ‘she will better show her Prudence by omitting them all.’ Instead, it was Swift who remarked that Barber ‘deserveth your Protection on account of her Wit and good Sense, as well as of her Humility, her Gratitude, and many other Virtues’ – particularly Barber’s readiness to submit to Swift’s correction. Swift’s strategy was to expose Barber’s faults, rectify them through his supervision, and champion her humility and gratitude. This would merit Orrery’s patronage, but had the added effect of making Barber more credible to an eighteenth-century audience.

There is also evidence to verify that Barber had read Swift’s letter before she delivered it to Orrery. In his letter, Swift states that he ‘suffered her to take a Copy’, along with giving her ‘the Liberty to make it public’. Barber printed it as part of the preface to her Poems, where the letter bears the date ‘Dublin, August 20 1733’. Barber underlines Swift’s credibility, reminding both Orrery (and her prospective readers) of ‘how fearless Dr.

269 Barber, Poems, iii-iv.
270 Barber, Poems, iv.
271 Barber, Poems, iv.
Swift hath ever been in satirizing Vice in the highest Stations, [and thus] will never suspect his Praise of the Great to proceed from an thing, but the Desire of doing Justice to uncommon, unsullied, Merit.\textsuperscript{272} Barber benefitted by association. Barber then foregrounds her personal connection with the earl, citing Orrery’s support at Tunbridge Wells in England, and his friendship with her in Ireland: ‘How shall I express the Sense I have of that great Goodness, wherewith you condescended to distinguish me when I was a Stranger in England; and after that, bounteously to enrich me in Ireland, at a time when my Want of Health made your Generosity the more valuable.’\textsuperscript{273} More specifically, Barber was referring to Orrery’s assistance in the raffle at the Wells, and the money he gave her in Ireland when she was ill. Orrery was an ideal patron, proffering introductions and money. He also represented Barber’s interest in both countries. Orrery was also part of an illustrious progeny, which Barber drew attention to in her Preface. Orrery, ‘shone remarkably in a Race, so early and so long distinguish’d for great Talents and Accomplishments, as the Family of BOYLE is allow’d to be.’\textsuperscript{274} For any prospective reader in England and/or Ireland during this period, the name ‘Boyle’ would have made an impression. The Boyles were a wealthy family of successful peers, landowners, patrons, scientists and artists. Richard Boyle, first Earl of Cork had been a pivotal figure in the English colonization of Ireland.\textsuperscript{275} His son Robert Boyle (1627-1691) was the eminent natural philosopher, chemist, physicist, and inventor. Orrery’s cousin, the wealthy Richard Boyle, third Earl of Burlington (1694-1753) and friend of Pope, earned such

\textsuperscript{272} [Give the actual title of the letter] ‘Barber to Orrery’, Barber, Poems, x.
\textsuperscript{273} Barber, Poems, xiv-xv.
\textsuperscript{274} Barber, Poems, xv.
epithets as the ‘Apollo of the Arts’ and the ‘Architect Earl’. Orrery’s father, Charles Boyle, was also a public figure, with a reputation for learning and held a fellowship of the Royal Society. Charles Boyle supported George Graham’s first mechanical solar system model that could demonstrate proportional motion of the planets around the sun – the device was named the ‘orrery’ in the earl’s honour.

The fifth Earl of Orrery [perhaps less distinguished than the rest of his family] had a difficult relationship to his father Orrery. Yet, he was proud of his family’s legacy. Barber’s dedicatory letter demonstrated her awareness of this as in it she observes Orrery’s ‘early Disposition to filial Piety’, a devotion which, Barber remarked, ‘was easily improved into conjugal Fidelity and Affection.’ The importance of family and marriage was central theme of several of Barber’s poems, particularly those dedicated to her sons. Highlighting the Boyle family’s collective genius, had the effect of adding lustre to Barber’s Poems also. This is visually represented on the architectural head-piece of Barber’s dedicatory letter which bears an engraved bookplate of the Boyle family coat of arms. The escutcheon of interlocking black and white banners, is surmounted by an earl’s coronet, flanked by two lions, underneath which is a scroll containing the motto: ‘Honour, Virtutis, Praemium’ meaning honour is the reward of virtue. Doubtless this would have appealed to the taste of Barber’s eighteenth-century readers (see Figures 1 and 2 below).
Fig. 1 Bookplate of John Boyle, 5th Earl of Orrery (1707–1762) with his initials ‘I. O.’ to the left of the coronet and the arms of Boyle impaling Hamilton to commemorate his marriage in 1738 to Margaret Hamilton, daughter of John Hamilton, Esq., of Caledon, County Tyrone. Motto: ‘Honor Virtutis Praemium’.
To the RIGHT HONOURABLE

JOHN, Earl of Orrery.

My Lord,

LTHO' Dr. Swift, in the fore-going Letter to your Lordship, which he has done me the Honour to permit me to publish, hath but slightly touch’d upon your numerous Virtues, as well as your Learning and Abilities; (probably with a Design of leaving me Room to enlarge

Fig. 2 Barber’s dedicatory letter to Boyle with the coronet, arms, and motto.
Barber included both Swift’s letter and her address to Orrery as part of the preface to her volume. It was a grand opening to her collection. The publication was designed to impress and appeal to the taste of readers. It proved Swift’s continuing support. This served to advertise Barber’s literary and aristocratic support, of which not many volumes of poems could boast, and it had the added advantage of elevating Barber above ‘the common Herd of Dedicators’, as Swift put it.  

Barber’s poems to her Dublin supporters

There are two distinct features of Barber’s verse-writing in Dublin during this time. Firstly, fewer poems dedicated to her Irish subscribers. Secondly, they are not about getting subscriptions as much as they are the product of a close-knit circle of friends and acquaintances. Barber dedicated two poems to Anne Donnellan during her subscription in Dublin: ‘To Mrs. Anne Donnellan, with the fourth Essay on Man’. The fourth epistle provides an appropriate conclusion to An Essay on Man, knitting the poem’s arguments together and ostensibly demonstrating man’s relation to and purpose in the universe. According to Pope’s argument, happiness is man’s ultimate goal and can only be attained through virtuous behavior. Barber’s poem to Donnellan noted ‘Philomela’s’ extraordinary singing voice: ‘Dear Philomela, oft you condescend, / With Notes Seraphic, to transport your Friend.’ Pope shows this reward to be a composed serenity free of earthly desires. Indeed, such serenity cannot derive from riches or fame, material goods or currencies which usually serve as an impediment to virtue anyway. The ‘soul’s calm sunshine’ that Pope describes allows man to transcend his earthly prison and look ‘through nature up to nature’s God,’ allowing man to pursue ‘that chain which links th’immense design, / Joins heav’n and earth, and mortal and divine’ (332).

281 ‘Swift to Orrery’, Barber, Poems, x.  
282 Barber, Poems, 180.
Other ‘Verses occasion’d by the Sickness of Mrs. Anne Donnellan highlights Barber’s concern for Donnellan’s health: ‘Goddess of Health, where’er you dwell, / To Philomela fly; O hasten from your rural Cell, / Nor let the Fair one die.’

Barber’s poem also echoes that of Isaac Watts, who wrote the following lines on Elizabeth Singer Rowe, also known for singing hymns for a rapt audience of respectable society: ‘I was all ear, and Philomela’s song / Was all Divine delight.’ However, Barber was critical of the young Frances-Arabella Kelly, whom she reveals as a conceited seductress who sneers at older women: ‘These Beldams who were born before me, Are grieved to see the Men adore me/ Their snaky Locks freeze up the Blood: My Tresses fire the purple Flood.’

Barber’s jealousy of Kelly’s influence with men, was possibly fired by Barber’s son, Con, who was infatuated with the young beauty and penned a poem to her along with a bowl of fruit: ‘To Mrs. Frances-Arabella Kelly, with a Present of Fruit’: ‘Tho’ the Plumb, and the Peach, with Apollo conspire, / To present you their Softness, and Sweetness, and Fire; / Their Aid is in vain; for what can they do, But blush, and confess themselves vanquish’d by you.’

Barber’s ‘The Recantation to the same Lady’ illustrates the importance of intellectual endeavour to this proto-Bluestocking group: ‘Your greatest Beauty’s in your Mind.’ There was nothing distinctively ‘Irish’ about Barber’s poems to her Dublin subscribers. Any of these poems could have been written at Tunbridge Wells or London. This is not surprising. In literary terms, Anglo-Irish poets, authors, essayists, playwrights of early-eighteenth century Dublin followed the same model as their fellow authors of English birth. They felt they belonged to the same community and addressed themselves to the same public. It is hardly surprising then, that the early-Georgian

---

283 Barber, Poems, 231.
285 Barber, Poems, 152-153.
286 Constantine Barber in Barber, Poems, 252.
287 Barber, Poems, 154.
writer, whether s/he aimed at reputation or profit, should have his/her eyes fixed on London. It was on the judgement of London critics that fame depended; it was in London that the best chance of fortune lay; and if fame and fortune failed, it was only in London that the struggling author could hope to hold starvation at bay by the labour of his/her pen. In Barber’s ‘An Apology to the Earl of Orrery, Dr. Swift, and some others of my Friends, for falling into Tears before them, on my leaving Ireland’ there is a genuine sense that Barber intended this trip to be final: ‘For O Hibernia! When I quit thy Coast, / Such Friends I leave as few cou’d ever Boast!’

**Barber’s aim to return to England and procure employment for her husband and sons**

Barber’s plan to relocate to England, close her subscription and publish her *Poems* remained unchanged. Dublin was the genesis of Barber’s literary efforts, but London held both the prospect for publication of her *Poems* and prosperity for her family. Barber had seen how Matthew Pilkington was successful in getting preferment in London from Alderman Barber through Swift. Swift wrote to London printer and local politician, Alderman John Barber (bap. 1675, d.1741) in the hopes that he might get employment for Rupert. No relation to Mary, Alderman Barber was a well-connected figure in London Tory circles with a considerable independent fortune. His defence of London’s political liberties and trading interests made him particularly popular, particularly with those opposed to Robert Walpole. In 1733, he successfully co-ordinated the city of London’s opposition to Walpole’s Excise Bill — a scheme to replace the tariff on wine and tobacco with an excise tax — which

---

288 Barber, *Poems*, 256.
289 To avoid confusion, I refer to Alderman John Barber as ‘Alderman Barber’ throughout.
established him as one of the city’s leading critics of Walpole.\textsuperscript{291} Through his friendship with Bolingbroke, Alderman Barber became part of a Tory circle which included Harley, Atterbury, Prior and Pope — and Delarivier Manley, who became his mistress. As printer, Alderman Barber’s contacts with the Tory party helped his rise in printing circles, through which he landed some lucrative contracts when the Tories achieved power in 1710.\textsuperscript{292} Swift became close friends with Alderman Barber when Barber acted as printer of The Examiner — a Tory journal to which Swift contributed and acted as editor. Mary Caesar was also a close friend of Alderman Barber, and transcribed his actions and speeches in some detail in her journal.\textsuperscript{293} Alderman Barber was a necessary part of Mary’s return to London.

Swift might have been confident of Alderman Barber’s willingness to accept Rupert and recommend him to friends, since earlier that summer — on the strength of Swift’s recommendation — he agreed to take on Matthew Pilkington in the lucrative position of mayoral chaplain. On 10 August, Swift wrote to Barber explaining how Matthew ‘hath a great longing to see England, and appear in the presence of Mr Pope, Mr Gay, Dr Arbuthnot, and some other of my Friends, wherein I will assist him with my Recommendations. He will be no burden upon you, for he hath some fortune of his own, and will have a much better from his father; and hath also a convenient establishment in a Church of this City.’\textsuperscript{294} Alderman Barber’s expeditious reply to Swift on 24 August welcomed the young clergyman: ‘For Sir, when I reflect on the many obligations I have to you, which I shall ever acknowledge, I am glad of any occasion to shew any gratitude; and do hereby, at your request, make Mr. Pilkington my chaplain, when mayor.’\textsuperscript{295}

Swift wrote to Alderman Barber on 14 December 1732 which demonstrates Barber’s

\textsuperscript{292} These included official printer of both the \textit{London Gazette} in 1711 and the South Sea Company.
\textsuperscript{293} Dorothy Potter, \textit{The Journal of Mary Freeman Caesar}, 48.
\textsuperscript{295} Swift, \textit{Corr.} 3: 529.
desire to return to London quickly. At the time of Swift’s letter, Alderman Barber was serving his term as the city’s Lord Mayor (1732–33). Swift hoped he might use his influence to prevail upon Alderman Barber’s ‘generous disposition’ to procure employment for Mary’s husband, Rupert: ‘It is therefore my request, and will be so likewise of some others among your friends, that if any Employment should fall vacant during your Government, which Mr Barber would be allowed capable of executing well, your Lordship would please that he might have the refusal.’ Swift added that Rupert ‘is of English birth; a very upright honest man, and his wife hath abundance of merit in all respects; they design to settle among you, having turned what fortune they had here, into money.’ In contrast with her Dublin subscription, Alderman Barber proved complicated and caused delays to her return. Alderman Barber did not express similar enthusiasm for Swift’s request on Rupert Barber’s behalf. His reply, which was delayed until the following 6 February 1733, stressed that Rupert was decidedly disadvantaged in his prospects on account of his lack of professional skills: ‘I should be glad to have it in my power to serve Mrs. Barber in the way you mention; but it is odds it may not be in my power, for many things may fall, that her spouse is not fit for; as, all places relating to the law, he can have no pretensions to.’ Doubtless, Rupert’s earlier bungling of the Dublin Castle linen contract with Dorset did little to instil much faith in his professional capabilities. Furthermore, unlike Matthew Pilkington, with his father’s fortune and a Church benefice, the Barbers had no inheritance, but had liquidated what little they owned to forge a new life in London. Alderman Barber had had enough of desperate ‘cousins’ and their demands on his resources. In his letter to Swift he makes clear that his reluctance to help the Barbers stemmed from his fear of being pestered by poor relations: ‘I have been, for many years, plagued with a set of ungrateful monsters called Cousins, that I tremble at the name; and though I give yearly pensions to some, and monthly and weekly to

others, all won’t do, and I am insulted and abused by them, and can’t help myself.”

Alderman Barber’s fears were heightened by Mary’s pronouncing him ‘cousin’ in public — a sure indicator that she might attempt to make him responsible for her family: ‘Now, as Mrs. Barber and her family design to settle here, and she has done me the honour in most places to call me Cousin, I hope it will not be expected that I should have the care of them. I have very ill health; and any additional care that way would hurt me very much.”

Mary Barber’s claim to kinship appears in the title of her verses ‘The Hibernian Poetess’s Address and Recommendation of her Son, to her dear Cousin Esq. L M of London’ as published in The Gentleman’s Magazine, March 1733. The poem makes light of her son, Rupert Jr.’s, Irish education by comparing his hopeful apprenticeship in London to ‘Peter the Wild Boy’ — who was found living a feral existence in the woods of Hanover and brought to the Royal Court as a pet:

In the wilds of Hibernia, this boy was beset,  
And caught, (as the Natives are there) in a Net.  
That creature has Sense, and in my Eye, is pretty,  
And has Talents to make a good-man in the City.  
Industrious, and orderly, prudent, and smart,  
And not too much Conscience, nor too little Art;  
Not scrup’lous but honest, a Heart set on Gain,  
Whose highest Ambition is fix’d on the Chain.

Barber’s playful emphasis on her son’s Irish upbringing must have been understood by her intended readers as an ironic reflection on English prejudices toward the Irish. However, her
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300 The Gentleman’s Magazine, 151. Barber had possibly send a copy to the Alderman before it was printed.
301 Peter the Wild Boy, who was found in a forest in Hanover was brought to England in 1725, by the order of King George I whose interest had been aroused during a visit to his homeland. An extraordinary amount of interest and curiosity concerning ‘Peter’ was excited in London. Swift penned a biting satire: The Most Wonderful Wonder that ever appeared to the Wonder of the British Nation, and Dr. Arbuthnot was employed by Princess Caroline to oversee Peter’s education. All efforts to teach Peter to read, write, and speak failed. The philosophers saw him as the noble savage they had been seeking to test out their ideas of civilisation, while satirists liked to use him to mock ‘polite’ society. It has since been established that Peter suffered from Pitt-Hopkins syndrome, a condition only identified in 1978, which manifests itself in a short stature, thick curvy cupid bow lips, drooping eyelids, coarse, curly hair, and some fingers which may be fused together. Peter was eventually sent to live on a farm in Birkemstead where he spent the latter part of his life. He died in his 80s in 1785. See Lucy Worsley, Courtiers: The Secret History of the Georgian Court (London: Faber, 2010), 87-110.
302 Barber, Poems, 225-26.
suggestion that her son ‘has Talents to make a good-man in the City’, must have caused Alderman Barber some unease — particularly when followed-up with Rupert Jr.’s designs on the mayoral ‘Chain’ of office. ³⁰³ Read another way, the poem is typical of Mary’s personal ambitions. It was she who felt caught in Ireland’s ‘Net’ and wished to free herself and her family from the fetters of impoverished life in Ireland. Mary had also proven her ‘Talents’ — industry, organisation, and prudence to exploit every opportunity to her advantage and ‘make good’ in London.

Undeterred by Alderman Barber’s disinclination to help his impoverished ‘cousins’, Swift wrote twice again on Mary’s behalf. This time, he used a different approach. The first of these letters, dated June 1733, emphasised Mary Barber’s connection to ‘Lord Orrery’ who ‘although almost a Stranger to her’ when she had met him first earlier at Tunbridge Wells ‘hath been extremely generous to her, in easing her of one part of her load.’ ³⁰⁴ Likely the ‘load’ Swift refers to here is Orrery’s acceptance to be Barber’s patron. More importantly, as a staunch Tory Jacobite, Orrery was also a good friend of John Barber. Swift continued his recommendation of Mary by highlighting her virtues: ‘I must desire leave to tell your Lordship, that I have not known a more bashful, modest person than Mrs. Barber, nor one who is less likely to ply her friends, Patrons, or Protectors for any favour; or is more thankfull for the smallest. Therefore I hope you will continue to do her any good office that lyes in your way, without trouble to Your self.’ Clearly, Swift was blatantly exaggerating qualities he believed would encourage Alderman Barber to support Mary. A glance at her subscription list alone, shows that Mary Barber was anything but ‘bashful’. Swift continued, noting his own generous subscription to ten copies of her Poems: ‘I thought I did a fine thing to subscribe for ten Copyes of her Poems; and she contriv’d to send me presents that in my

³⁰³ An addendum to this verse in Barber’s Poems notes that ‘good man’ implied ‘The City-Phrase for a rich Man’. Barber, Poems, 226.
conscience are worth more than the money I subscrib’d.\footnote{Swift Corr. 3: 657.} We have no details of the ‘presents’ Swift refers to here. Fruit was always a popular gift in these circles, as was lines of verse. Earlier, Mary Barber had been witness to a Standish (for holding pens) and some paper that Laetitia Pilkington had given Swift, so it is possible that her gifts were along similar lines.

The combination of Swift’s persistence and Mary’s patronage connection with Orrery proved sufficiently persuasive. Two months later, on 6 August 1733, John Barber replied: ‘I shall have great regard to your recommendations in favour of Mrs Barber, and shall not fail of doing her any service in my power.’ To this end, Alderman Barber subscribed to five copies of Barber’s Poems. This was half the number of copies that Swift subscribed for, he excused this by claiming: ‘I have thought to be a lucky man; but this year fortune has been my foe.’\footnote{Swift Corr. 3: 685.} It is likely that Alderman Barber encouraged six other ‘Aldermen’ of London to subscribe for a further copy each including Gilbert Heathcote (1702–03) (erroneously noted on Barber’s list as ‘Alderman Gilbert King’); Sir Robert Bayliss [sic] (1719–20); George Champion (1729–30); Robert Kendal (1733–35); John Salter (1730–1732) and Sir Francis Child (1721–22) who immediately preceeded John Barber as Lord Mayor of London and is notable for becoming head of Child’s Bank at No. 1 Fleet Street.\footnote{All above dates are taken from Alfred P. Beaven ‘‘List of Aldermen 1701-1800’, The Aldermen of the City of London: Temp. Henry III – 1912, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=67243 (accessed 3 November 2012). ‘Child, Sir Francis, the younger (c.1684–1740),’ Philip Winterbottom in ODNB, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5287 (accessed August 21, 2013).} Other subscriptions through Alderman Barber included Mrs. Sarah Dufkin (John Barber’s wife following the death of Delarivier Manley) and her brother, Mr Dufkin, also subscribed to Barber’s Poems. Mrs. Charlotte D’Avenant, another of Alderman Barber’s mistresses, also subscribed for a further copy.\footnote{C. A. Rivington, Tyrant’: the story of John Barber, 1675 to 1741 (York: William Sessions, 1989).}

Alderman Barber is important because his contribution sums up Barber’s notion of
success. She wanted to set up her husband in employment, so that she could retire and live the genteel lifestyle she had forged through her Poems. Mary Barber’s son, Rupert Jr., who was not destined to take the mayoral chain of office was eventually apprenticed to Arthur Pond (1701–1758), who had a studio at Great Queen Street, near Lincoln’s Inn Fields. Pond’s studio would prove a useful collection point for Barber’s Poems (see Chapter 5).

Barber’s dedication to Alderman Barber was later included in her Poems. Barber revised the title, ‘To the Right Honourable John Barber, Esq; Lord Mayor of London, on committing one of my Sons to his Care’, which dropped the ‘offending’ claim to cousinage. In a further ironic twist Barber re-dated the poem to 29 September 1733, the official day of Alderman Barber’s departure from mayoral office and the date by which Barber might have offered some additional care to Mary Barber’s family. Alderman Barber presents a contrast between how easy it was to get subscriptions in Dublin and navigating support in London. Barber’s list reflects her interests on both sides of the Irish Sea and the network between the two countries. One had to work at getting subscriptions in London. London was the natural capital, but Dublin had an active literary life and the encouragement of familiar example in the way of Delany, Sheridan, and Grierson. It was natural for Barber to return to Dublin, not only to collect her belongings, but to consolidate a literary enterprise that had its roots in a growing city.

In the summer of 1733, Barber was ready to return to England. In her preface she wrote: ‘It is my Happiness to have received support and Encouragement from many in both kingdoms, to whom it is an honour to be indebted.’ Throughout her three-year subscription Barber brought her business experience to the task of building a support base among the

---
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leading families in Dublin, London, Wells and Bath who were able to cultivate important contacts and use them to the benefit of both her family and her literary output. At Tunbridge, poetry was a successful vehicle for making contacts and getting subscriptions. Through Swift she had an enviable literary and social network between London and Dublin. She used Swift to write letters on her behalf, and travelled to Tunbridge and London to ensure that those connections bore fruit. Subscription-hunting was a learning process. Barber made mistakes – she was too modest with Lady Germain, and too forward with Pope. At other moments she was subject to unfortunate delays in the post, her husband’s bungling of lucrative contract and was embroiled in the public scandal of the Caroline Letters Affair. These connections give her subscription list a distinctiveness that other lists do not have. Swift remained supportive: ‘I hope by the Success of [Barber’s] poems, she will be made tolerably easy, and independent as she well deserves for her Virtue and good Sense’. 311 Confident that she had overcome numerous obstacles both metaphorical and literal, she had yet to face the greatest challenge to the publication of her Poems.

Chapter 5: Publication: *Poems on Several Occasions* (London, 1734)

In the summer of 1733 Barber was ready to return to England to close her subscription and print her *Poems*. Her plan was to return to Bath where she hoped that she and her family would set up home and shop. Mary Pendarves summarised her intentions thus: ‘Mrs. Barber is to settle with her family at Bath: her husband, who is a woollen-draper, is to carry on his business, and she will let lodgings.’\(^{312}\) To first fulfil her obligation to her subscribers, Barber set about getting her *Poems* printed. In July, *The Dublin Journal* advertised her wish to close her subscription list and have her Poems printed ‘immediately’.\(^{313}\) Despite her best efforts, the publication of her *Poems* was interrupted for a further two years. She not only continued to suffer from the gout which had prevented the timely closure of her subscription, but her involvement in the publication of poems by Swift in London — two of which warranted the charge of treason — resulted in her arrest and imprisonment shortly before her quarto’s anticipated release in 1733. A protracted court summons further delayed the circulation of her *Poems* until May 1735 — two years after she had returned to England.

This chapter investigates afresh the delays to Barber’s publication to provide for the first time, a comprehensive picture of Barber’s publication. Firstly, I examine the enforced delays to the printing of Barber’s poems due to her continuing gout and her embroilment with the London authorities in January 1734. My reading of these events show that despite the difficulties Barber encountered leading up to the publication of her *Poems* she managed to maintain her public profile and the support of her patrons, Swift and Orrery. The second section provides a comprehensive analysis of the publication details for Barber’s *Poems*. Her collection was printed by Samuel Richardson for Charles Rivington and ran to three editions.


\(^{313}\) *The Dublin Journal*, 14 July 1733.
— the first printing in quarto folio and two further reprints in octavo format. The final section concludes with the reception of Barber’s Poems in order to understand how her collection was received in its own time and demonstrates how Barber set about the publication of her Poems in order to fulfil a larger goal, which was to relocate her family to Bath.

On 8 August 1733 Barber travelled to England with Orrery and Laetitia Pilkington.\textsuperscript{314} She took with her a bundle of letters from Swift to convey to his correspondents in England, and a packet of Swift’s poems for Matthew Pilkington to have printed in London. Swift’s letters — to Mrs Caesar, Mrs Conduitt, Sir Andrew Fountaine, the Earl of Oxford, Countess Granville and Mrs Pratt — were intended to revive interest in Barber’s subscription, which had been held up due to Barber’s recurring gout.\textsuperscript{315} Swift’s letter to Sir Andrew Fountaine (1676–1753), a notable art collector and favourite of Queen Caroline, explained the delay to Barber’s Poems thus: [Mrs Barber] ‘came hither onely to settle some affairs, intending to return very soon; but was caught by a long fit of the Gout, and frequent returns; but is now well enough to depart in a few days.’\textsuperscript{316}

As specified in Chapter 3, Barber had been suffering from gout from at least 1730 when she first visited Tunbridge Wells. In her Preface, Barber’s referred to her ‘sedentary Life’.\textsuperscript{317} A sluggish lifestyle (along with heavy alcohol consumption and a protein-rich diet) is one of the leading factors which contribute to the onset of the illness. In the eighteenth century, gout rose to almost epidemic proportions. According to Porter and Rousseau, the

\textsuperscript{314} Irvin Ehrenpreis has observed that Laetitia Pilkington sailed over with Mary Barber, for whom Swift was preparing letters of introduction between 30 July and 2 August. Ehrenpreis, Swift, 3: 759. Laetitia was going to visit Matthew, who had left Ireland the previous autumn with his friend, and fellow \textit{bon vivant} Edward Walpole, to take up his post as chaplain to Alderman Barber. Mary and Laetitia would have sailed on the yacht from Dublin with Lord Orrery – The \textit{Dublin Evening Post} for 7/11 August reported Orrery as being on board. Elias, \textit{Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington}, 2: 440.

\textsuperscript{315} Woolley identifies Mrs. Pratt as ‘Henrietta Pratt’. Mrs. Henrietta Pratt’s letter to Swift notes: ‘Sir, Not many days ago I had the pleasure of yours by Mrs Barber, whose turn seems to give the good impression you give of her. I want not more than your recommendation to engage my wishes to serve her, and also my endeavours, if any opportunity falls in my way.’ The letter from Swift is unrecovered. Swift to Mrs. Pratt, 10 November 1733, \textit{Swift Corr.} 3: 703.


\textsuperscript{317} Barber, \textit{Poems}, xiv.
‘gout wave’ suggests the affluence and leisure in the ‘first consumer society’ where the population was exposed to more protein-rich diets and indulgent habits that provoked the onset of the disease.\textsuperscript{318} Gout loomed large, not just for sufferers but in the collective mind, as part of the privileges and penalties of affluence. Doubtless gout served as a useful conversation topic for Barber among the \textit{bon ton} at Tunbridge Wells, and perhaps persuaded people of her social standing (and affluence).

However by 1733, it began to govern her daily movements. She was confined to bed and consequently her preparations to return to England were continually postponed. In a letter to her sister, Anne, from Dublin in the winter of 1733, Mary Pendarves gave a bleak prognosis of Barber’s debilitating condition: ‘I saw Mrs. Barber last night. She is still confined, and the doctor gives but small hopes of her ever recovering the entire use of her limbs.’\textsuperscript{319} The disease is brought on by an abnormally high concentration of uric acid in the blood (hyperuricaemia) which provokes the deposition of sodium urate in the outer joints, which in turn can become swollen and inordinately painful. Gout attacks are a source of extreme discomfort (attacks are frequently accompanied by inflammation and fever). The major English physician Thomas Sydenham (1624–1689) demonstrated that gout was a progressively crippling malady:

The pain resembles that of a dislocated bone and this is immediately succeeded by a chillness, shivering and slight fever. [The pain] grows gradually more violent every hour, and comes to its height towards the evening, adapting itself to the numerous bones of the tarsus and metatarsus, the ligaments whereof it affects. [The parts affected] become so exquisitely painful as not to endure the weight of clothes nor the shaking of the room from a person’s walking briskly therein. [Things worsen] till after twenty-four hours from the first approach of the fit.\textsuperscript{320}

\textsuperscript{319} A later letter from Mrs. Delany to her sister from Delville, 19 July 1744: ‘Monday I invited all the Barber race, and our good old friend, though she had the gout upon her, and was forced to be lifted out upon men’s shoulders, came, and was delighted with my new room, and seemed very happy to see me mistress of this charming place.’ Llanover, \textit{The Autobiography and Correspondence of Mary Delany}, 1: 402-3; 2: 316.
\textsuperscript{320} Thomas Sydenham, ‘A Treatise of the Gout’, in \textit{The Works of Thomas Sydenham M.D. on chronic and acute diseases wherein their histories and modes of cure are recited by him}, are delivered with accuracy and perspicuity. To which are added notes corrective and explanatory (London, 1788), 184-185.
There is evidence to document Barber’s difficulties with the illness. Swift’s letter to Lord Oxford on 2 August 1733 vividly zoomorphosizes Barber’s gout as an animal biting at her limbs: ‘This letter will be delivered to you by Mrs Barber, who coming over hither last Year on her private affairs was snapt by the Gout, who made her such frequent visits that it prevented her return to London for severall Months.’

![James Gillray, The Gout, 1799](1)

Barber also documented the physical effects of the disease in her verse. In ‘To Dr. Richard Helsham upon my Recovery from a dangerous Fit of Sickness’ and ‘To Mrs. S[ican] written in my Sickness’ describe Barber’s increasing physical discomfort. The psychological effects of the illness are also palpable. In ‘To Lady Sarah Cowper’, Barber expresses the terror and madness which resulted from physical pain: ‘O, shield me from the dreadful Storms, / Which my distemper’d Fancy forms!’ In ‘To Mrs. Sican written in my Sickness’, Barber calls for her friend ‘To sooth the long-distracted Brain, / And conquer ev’n the tyrant Pain.’ In ‘An Hymn to Sleep written when the Author was Sick’, Barber documents a protracted insomnia: ‘Somnus, pow’rful Deity, / Mortals owe their Bliss to thee. How long shall I thy Absence
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mourn, / And when be bless’d in thy Return.” The only poem which appeared under Barber’s name following the publication of her Poems—‘Verses said to be written by Mrs Mary Barber. To a Friend desiring an Account of her Health in Verse’—printed in London in 1737—compares well with Sydenham’s account above:

There long, alas! Tyrant Gout has sway’d,
And tortur’d in defiance—e’en of Mead.
That sage humane, who, gen’rous, unretain’d,
The anguish which he cou’d not cure restrain’d.
At length the torturer ceas’d, yet here I lie;
My feeble joints their wonted aid deny.
My freezing limbs a vital warmth scarce know,
And my pulse beats irregular and low.  

The reference to Dr. Richard Mead, Barber’s physician, presents a direct connection between Barber and this poem. As noted in Chapter 4, Mead attended both Queen Anne and Alexander Pope. However, unfortunately for Barber, Mead’s understanding of gout was unhelpful. He believed that a fit of gout cleared the system, and for that reason it was probably best not to tamper with it: ‘gout is the cure of gout’ was a dictum of Mead’s, destined endlessly to be quoted by the medical fraternity. Mead also does not appear to have made the connection between gout and alcohol consumption. His friend, the physician and antiquarian William Stukeley (1687–1765) suffered frequent fits of gout once he began dining with Mead, with whom he ‘drank nothing but French wine, so that I was every winter laid up with gout.’ Mead’s penchant for purchasing expensive, imported wines, as Barber’s, ‘To Dr. Mead, on his Cape Wine’, suggests that wine was used for medicinal purposes, as it: ‘Dispels the Spleen and conquers Pain, / Calls back departing Life again.’
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325 Barber, Poems, 90.
326 The poem was dated 20 May 1735. It was printed in the Gentleman’s Magazine in March 1737.
328 Barber, Poems, 128.
329 By the end of the previous century wine was being cultivated in the hinterland of Cape Town and sold through the Dutch East India Company. For a full discussion of the changes taking place in wine production during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries see P.T.H. Unwin, Wine and the Vine (London: Routledge, 1996), 233-65.
Doubtless, medical bills with the famous Dr Mead and prescriptions of claret proved costly for Barber. Swift’s letter to Mary Pendarves on 29 January 1735 highlights the cost of Barber’s illness to both her Poems and her public reputation with subscribers: ‘[Mrs. Barber’s] sickness hath made her more expensive than her prudence or nature inclined her.’

At this time, the potential cost to Barber’s reputation far outweighed her medical expenses. The chief difficulty was the delay in the printing of her Poems and her gout was seen as an excuse for the ongoing delay. Swift’s letter to Mary Caesar, Barber’s London patron, observed the ill-effects gout had inflicted on Barber in her attempts to close her subscription: ‘She hath been afflicted with so many repetitions of the gout, that her limbs are much weakened, and her Spirits sunk, neither can I well blame her, considering her grand affair of subscription must needs have slackened in her absence.’ In another letter to Lord Oxford (whom Swift had earlier urged to subscribe) Swift explained: ‘I believe you, or My Lady Oxford or Lady Margaret, have subscribed for her poetical works, which would have been published before this time, if she had not been so long confined by her illness here.’

A letter from Mrs. Conduitt to Swift on 29 November 1733 clearly shows that Barber’s subscription was already exhausted long before the delays to the publication: ‘the town has been so long invited into the subscription, that most people have already refused or accepted, and Mr. Conduitt has long since done the latter.’ As early as June 1733, Barber’s Dublin friend, Frances-Arabella Kelly, was pressed to make excuses for her. She wrote to Swift from Bristol Hotwell: ‘I wish any thing would send Barber here; for I was at the Bath to see some of my friends, and was forced to swear that only the want of health kept her book from being
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published.’334 The newspapers also reflected concerns about money. In July, *The Gentleman’s Magazine* focused on her desire for prompt publication of her volume: ‘Mrs Barber, whose sickness has prevented her from publishing her Poems, which she long since intended to have done; designs to have them printed immediately.’335 By 20 October 1733 the *Daily Journal* printed an advertisement which announced that the quarto was about to be published and he excused this late date by mentioning Barber’s ongoing ill health. This was only one of several public apologies for the continued delay.336 Barber’s verse highlighted her true feeling which lamented the lack of understanding for her condition among ‘genteel’ society. In ‘To a Lady who commanded me to send her an account in verse, how I succeeded in my Subscription’, the insensitive character of ‘Belvedira’ comments:

Besides, I oft have heard it hinted,
   Her Poems never will be printed:
   Her Sickness is a Feint, no Doubt,
   To keep her Book from coming out.337

In apologetic tones Barber attempted to account for the delay in her Preface: ‘The Affairs of my Family having called me back to Ireland, before my Subscription was finished, I was so unhappy as to be long confined there by my Want of Health, which prevented me from paying my Debt to my Subscribers, as soon as I ought to have done.’338 Of course, as demonstrated in Chapter 3, her delay in Dublin had been further protracted as she awaited news of her husband’s employment from Alderman Barber.

Despite the pressure to satisfy questioning subscribers, the printing of Barber’s *Poems* was delayed for a further two years, advertisements in the London press for October 1733 notwithstanding. Barber documented in her Preface: ‘since my Return hither, a new
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335 *The Gentleman’s Magazine*, 10 July 1733, 379.
336 Others may be found in the *Dublin Journal* throughout the summer of 1733, in issues printed on 10/14 July, 14/17 July, 24/28 July, 25/29 September and 6/8 October.
338 Barber, *Poems*, xxv.
Perplexity hath obliged me to trespass further upon their Patience’.

This ‘new Perpelexity’ was Barber’s unanticipated entanglement with the London authorities in January 1734. Before Barber travelled to England in August 1733, Swift gave her a packet containing six manuscript poems which she was to convey to Matthew Pilkington so that he could have them published anonymously in London. The package contained An Epistle to a Lady. Addressed to Lady Acheson of Market Hill in Ireland, On Reading Dr. Young’s Satyr, On Poetry: A Rapsody, and three scatological poems: A Beautiful Young Nymph Going to Bed, Strephon and Chloe, and Cassinus and Peter. According to Laetitia Pilkington, she and Barber travelled from Parkgate (a small seaport about twelve miles west of Chester) to London where Barber promptly delivered to Matthew Pilkington ‘a letter and some poetry from the Dean’, which would be published before the year’s end in London. Pilkington first offered the poems to Benjamin Motte, Swift’s bookseller in London. Motte refused to publish the Epistle, but probably suggested Lawton Gilliver — one of the chief shareholders of the Grub Street Journal — as printer. In a letter to Swift, Motte reveals how Gilliver ‘was resolved, if he came into trouble, I would have a share of it, though I offered, in case he would not name me, that I would bear one half of his expenses.’ The six poems were delivered to Lawton Gilliver, and two other booksellers of the Grub-Street Journal, J. Huggonson and J. Roberts. The poems appeared in three separate pamphlets. The first, containing An Epistle to a Lady and On Reading Dr. Young’s Satyr, was printed on 26 November 1733. John Wilford, another shareholder in the Grub Street Journal, appears as publisher on the Epistle’s title page. The Epistle was followed by the scatological trio which were published by J. Roberts. The last pamphlet, On Poetry: A Rapsody, bore the name J. Huggonson as publisher.
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340 Elias, Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington, 1: 63-64; 2: 439-42. Barber and Pilkington must have parted ways with Orrery at Parkgate.
342 Wilford took over as its publisher on 3 July 1735.
The publication of *An Epistle to a Lady* was the first publication to cause offence. Dedicated to Swift’s friend, Lady Acheson, the poem ventriloquises Acheson to make a case concerning the effects of Swift’s political works. The poem is presented in the form of a dialogue between Swift and Acheson in which the latter begs him not to make her the subject of his satire. In it, Swift targets Walpole and his propaganda machine in London, observing how both Whig and Tory writers were competing for the same Grub Street crown with similar texts: ‘How the helm is ruled by Walpole, / At whose oars, like slaves, they all pull.’ Line 133, was deemed particularly offensive in which Swift challenges, not only Walpole and his followers, but the King himself: ‘Should a monkey wear a crown, / Must I tremble at his frown?’ These lines offended the Secretary of State, Lord Harrington, and on 11 December 1733, he sent a copy to the Attorney General citing three passages as libellous of the King and his Government, Sir Robert Walpole, and members of the House of Commons, with a request that he consider prosecution. In a letter to the Attorney General from Whitehall on 11 December 1733, Lord Harrington wrote: ‘Sir, I send you inclosed by the King’s Command, the Craftsman of last Saturday and a Copy of Verses Entitled, an Epistle to a Lady, and am commissioned by his Majesty to signify to you his Pleasure, that you take the same into Consideration, and report your Opinion whether you judge there be sufficient Matter in both or either of them, whereon to ground a prosecution.’

Walpole was not concerned by the poem’s appearance. On 26 November he was in Norfolk where he had travelled on 18 November with ‘Grafton, the Pelhams and the rest of his cronies.’ They were there on their annual spree, the purposes of which were, as Lord
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345 The National Archives (TNA): Public Record Office (PRO), SP 44/88, f 123r.
346 TNA: PRO, SP 44/83.
Hervey wrote, ‘to hunt, be noisy, jolly, drink, comical and pure merrie.’ However, members of his administration were on the lookout for anything that might be libellous. Thomas has demonstrated how political censorship of the press between 1702 and 1730 was haphazard rather than systematic. In 1731, when the Tory press had reorganised and was operating with renewed vigour under the leadership of the Craftsman, indictments show the beginning of Walpole’s decade of press prosecutions. The poetry of Swift, like the political journalism of the Craftsman, was one of the first targets of Walpole’s supporters. By the time Walpole returned to London in mid-December, prosecution against Swift’s messengers had already begun.

The outrage was further prompted by the publication of On Poetry: A Rapsody. The poem followed the logic of Pope’s Dunciad in accusing some writers of prostituting themselves to the Whig ministry: ‘And lo, his ministers of state, / Transformed to imps, his levees wait.’ Others sought to advance themselves through corruption and backhanders: ‘And as they sail in Charon’s boat / Contrive to bribe the judge’s boat’. Moore has suggested that the word ‘Rapsody’ in the poem’s title is a double pun upon a ‘rap, or knock on the head,’ and ‘a rap’ or spurious counterfeit coin, indicating Swift’s aim to mock British literary culture, which he regards as the source of counterfeit writing that demeans cultural value. In Dublin, lord lieutenant Dorset made inquiries about the poems’ printing. In London, Swift’s Rapsody prompted an anonymous response, A Rap at the Rapsody, printed in

350 Swift, Poems, 835 (lines 187-196).
351 Swift, Poems, 835 (lines 205-234).
353 Each pamphlet bears the false claim that it had been Dublin printed and was now London reprinted. In Dublin on 25 December 1733 Lord Dorset, who was consulted by Lord Harrington about the Dublin printings, replied: ‘Upon the receipt of it, I immediately caused the most strict, and diligent inquiry to be made, whether the Libel inclosed in it, had been first printed in Dublin, as is mentioned in the Title-page, and have reason to be convinced that it was not; both because it was never mentioned here in ordinary conversation, and because I am assured, that a Dublin Bookseller, seeing a Paper advertised under that Title in the London Newspapers, sent for a printed Copy from thence, with a design to Re-print it here.’ TNA: PRO, SP 63/396, f. 124r.
1734. The *Rap* accused Swift of corruption in getting the post of Dean:

> Yet can you say, that to your Teaching,
> Your Post was owing, or your Preaching?
> You know, be sure Sir, what I mean,
> How swiftly you were made a Dean!

The poem also provocatively called for his head:

> In vain, with cracking Whip, you rout him,
> Menac’d he lays more wild about him
> In vain from Mischief you immure him
> A wholesome Cord can only cure him.\(^{354}\)

Swift, however, was not arrested. As Fischer has observed, while it might have been hard to get Swift out of Ireland, if Walpole wanted to prosecute Swift he could have done so easily.\(^{355}\) That was the truth that Carteret conveyed to Swift at the height of his popularity as Drapier in 1724. It was no less true, nine years later.\(^{356}\) Walpole’s censorship operated by avoiding direct conflict with the major figures of the opposition while attacking the printers and booksellers without whom the major figures lacked their means of public access. The poems were categorised as libellous with the result that a series of arrests were ordered of the perpetrators in the New Year.

On Friday 11 January, John Wilford, whose name appeared on the title-page as publisher of the *Epistle*, was arrested. On Wednesday 16 January, the printer, Samuel Aris, was also arrested, probably because of Wilford’s information, and on the following Monday, 21 January, Lawton Gilliver, copyright-holder, was likewise taken into custody. Gilliver was released the following day, but not before he had implicated both Matthew Pilkington and the printer, Benjamin Motte. In a letter to Swift, Motte is critical of Gilliver’s conduct and explains that Gilliver was arrested before he could adequately advise him.\(^{357}\) On Wednesday 30 January, Mary Barber was taken into custody on the information of Matthew
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\(^{354}\) *A Rap at the Rapsody* (London, 1734), 5,7.


\(^{356}\) See also Ehrenpreis, Swift, 3: 275-77.

Additional charges were also laid against two sellers of the pamphlets, Ruth Charleton and Alice Nutt, for distributing the alleged libel. The six accused (Wilford, Aris, Gilliver, Motte, Pilkington, and Barber) were held until payment of £200 recognizance. John Wilford, acting as ‘trade publisher’, was bailed on 14 January; Mr. Aris, printer, was bailed on 18 January; Lawton Gilliver, the bookseller proprietor, was bailed on 25 January; Benjamin Motte, on 25 January; Barber, on the 1 February. The London Evening Standard for Saturday 31 January 1734 reported that ‘[Mrs. Barber] was examined yesterday (Friday) in the evening, and admitted to Bail.’ £200 recognizance was a considerable sum of money. It is possible that her patron Orrery paid some part of her bail. A letter from Barber addressed to Swift from ‘Mr More’s an Upholsterer in Conduit Street’, in London’s West End confirms that Barber was released on bail. Matthew Pilkington, as accessory, was bailed on 7 February.

As with the forged letter to Queen Caroline in 1731, Barber again found herself embroiled in a public and potentially disastrous predicament. This time she faced criminal charges. However, the verdict of the King’s Bench court made clear that her involvement was deemed contemptible and rebellious. Barber was accused of being an ‘ill-disposed person’
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358 The Daily Post Boy, 2 February 1734 reported that ‘On Wednesday [30 January] Mary Barber was taken up [i.e. arrested] by two of his majesty’s messengers on the information of the rev. Mr. [Matthew] Pilkington, Chaplain to the late Lord Mayor, on the account of an Epistle to a Lady.’

359 Alice Nutt and Ruth Charleton, along with Mary Cooke, Anne Dodd and Jo Read, were members of an exclusively female conger (association of copyright-sharing trade members whose combined strength allowed them to share the investment load of expensive printing tasks) who produced the expensive Annotations on the Holy Bible in 1735. See Paula McDowell, The Women of Grub Street: Press, Politics, and Gender in the London Literary Marketplace, 1678-1730 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 43.

360 TNA: PRO, SP 44/83, 124r.

361 London Evening Post, 31 January 1734. The Penny London Post for Monday 4 February also carried the same story.


363 In her letter of dedication, Barber had quoted lines from an earlier letter addressed to her from Orrery which concluded: ‘If you think you owe any Thanks on this Account, remember to whom they are due, — to a Being, who, I hope, will one Day put it in my Power, to show myself to many others, as well as to you, a Sincere Friend.’ Barber to Orrery’, Barber, Poems, xiv-xv.


365 ‘The Recognizance of Mary Barber, wife of Rupert Barber of the Kingdom of Ireland dated 1 February 1734’ was ‘sent by Mr. Kuoni, Messenger’ along with the recognizance ‘of Matthew Pilkington dated 7 February 1734’ to Mr. Paxton on the 9 February 1734. TNA: PRO, SP 44/83, 124.
and, worse still, ‘the vendor and publisher of false scandalous seditious and malicious Libels’. Barber’s ‘wicked’ intent to ‘disturb the public peace and tranquillity of this kingdom and intending to scandalise and vilify our said Lord the King and his administration of the Government of this Kingdom’, was also deemed ‘to scandalise and discredit the Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Walpole’. The implications of this charge were considerable. Each of these offences was presumed to militate against public peace and tranquillity; each was criminal in eighteenth-century Common Law and punishable by any or all of the following: fine, imprisonment, pillory, whipping, removal of the ears, and branding. Barber did not suffer any of the above physical punishments, but along with Motte, she was obliged to attend the court at the opening and closing of each of the next six court terms, until the magistrates invited her to dispute the charge on the first day of Michaelmas Term, 23 October 1734. On this date, Barber pleaded not guilty to the charges made against her. However, despite her protestations Barber faced trial on the Octave (eighth) of Hillary term. The following May, she submitted a document to Lord Harrington requesting that he put an end to the prosecution. The petition affirms that Barber was ‘about two Years Ago was taken into Custody of a Messenger [i.e. arrested] by Virtue of a Warrant from your Lordships Office for being the supposed publisher of a pamphlet Intitled an Epistle to a Lady.’ The plea then details the progress of the prosecution against Barber in the King’s Bench court through eight court terms, that is, two years. Barber maintained that, though she was obliged to attend the King’s Bench on the first and last day of each court term, no action was taken in her case through four full terms. The petition also documents that Barber was arrested on false information exhibited against her, ‘to which’, she insists, ‘your petitioner Immediately

366 TNA: PRO SP. 44/83
368 TNA: PRO KB 28/131, no. 13.
369 The King’s Bench Rolls recorded: ‘Mary Barber Wife of Rupert Barber by William Clarke her Attorney and having the said Information read she saith that she is not guilty there and hereupon she putteth herself upon the Country and the aforesaid John Willes Esq. Attorney General.’ TNA: PRO, SP 44/83.
pleaded Not Guilty and Notice of Tryall was given and afterwards Countermanded And a fresh Notice of Tryall hath been given this Term.’ The petition also emotively observed the adverse effect the delay was having on Barber’s personal affairs and persuasively argued that the delay prevented her from taking care of her family: ‘That your petitioner by this prosecution hath been put to very great Charges is not only disabled from attending the business of her Family — which is settled in Dublin but suffers greatly from a long stay being obliged for the satisfaction of her Bail to reside in London till the said prosecution shall be ended.’

The petition was signed ‘Mary Barber’ — and is notable here as the only extant example we have of her signature (see Figure 3 below). To complicate matters the prosecution against Barber was delayed. Her trial was twice docketed: for Hilary term 1734/35 and Easter term 1735. Twice the sheriffs of the City of London failed on the day to produce a jury to hear the case. The summons was dropped but the criminal charge remained in effect until it was finally abandoned on the last day of Easter Term in the following year, 19 May 1735. On 27 May 1735 that Mary Barber and Motte were officially discharged from their summons.
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370 TNA: PRO, SP 36/35, f. 62.
371 The Court records: ‘On which said Thursday next after the Octave of St. Hilary the sheriffs of London sent not their writ for that purpose Therefore in like manner as before let a jury thereupon come before our said Lord the King at Westminster on Wednesday next after fifteen days from the Feast [sic] day of Easter. On which said Wednesday the sheriffs of the said city of London sent not their writ for that purpose.’ K. B., 28/131, 13.
372 TNA: PRO, KB 28/131, no. 13.
To the Right Honorable the Lord Harrington, one of His Majesties principal Secretaries of State.

The humble petition of Mary Barber, the wife of John Barber, Chisney, Draper of Dublin.

Showeth. That your petitioner about two years ago was taken into the custody of a messenger by virtue of a Warrant from your Lordship's Office for being the suspected publisher of a pamphlet entitled an "Assignment to a Lady who desired the Author to make Service on her in the Service of a Nobleman." Your petitioner gave Bail for her appearance at the Majority's Court of King's Bench to answer any Charge that should be exhibited against her.

That your petitioner did accordingly appear in the said Court the first and last days of four several terms after she was admitted to Bail by the Judges for the Reason not Thinking it proper during that time to carry on any prosecution against your petitioner for the Misdemeanor alleged.

That about twelve months ago an Information was Exhibited against your petitioner containing several Charges against your petitioner to which your petitioner immediately pleaded Not Guilty and Pleaded Not Guilty, and was afterwards Commanded and a fresh Indictment of the same had been given her against.

That your petitioner by this procession hath been put to very great Charges and is not only disabled from attending the business of her family which is situated in Dublin but suffers greatly by a long Stay being obliged for the doing Business of her Business to reside in London and the said prosecution shall be ended.

Your petitioner therefore humbly prays your Lordship to take her Case into your Lordship's Consideration and humbly hopes your Lordship's Consideration will induce your Lordship to put an End to the said prosecution which hath already been very much, and your petitioner is of your Lordship's Proceedings will not interfere with the Issue of your petitioner and her Family and your Orders as in duty bound.

Shall ever for ever.

Mary Barber
Fischer has rightly suggested that the charges against Barber and Pilkington might have been dropped due to the intercession of Swift’s friend, Alderman Barber.\textsuperscript{373} The alderman was familiar with press prosecution. In 1709, he was prosecuted for publishing his lover Delarivier Manley’s \textit{New Atlantis}, and again, in 1714, for printing Swift’s \textit{The Public Spirit of the Whigs}.\textsuperscript{374} If Alderman Barber did interest himself in the case, it would not have been the first time he had meddled in King’s Bench matters. As Hanson observes, ‘in 1729, when [the publisher of the \textit{Craftsman}, Richard] Francklin was acquitted, he almost certainly owed his release to the fact that the jury had been chosen by Alderman Barber, the acquaintance of Bolingbroke, Pope and Swift.’\textsuperscript{375}

The arrest and trial left Barber utterly discouraged. On 2 March 1734, Mary Pendarves sympathised: ‘Poor Barber is very much dejected, and I am sorry for it; I doubt [i.e. I think] her circumstances are not in the best way, and this last affair has been very troublesome and mortifying to her, though there can be nothing against her of consequence.’\textsuperscript{376} On the 4 March 1734, the Duchess of Queensberry wrote to Swift: ‘Mrs Barber has met with a good deal of trouble; I have not seen her I fancy for that reason, but we shall leave our G[uinea]s for her with Mr Pope or my brother.’\textsuperscript{377} The daily newspapers were blunt and provocative in their accounts of Barber’s arrest. \textit{The Post Boy}’s report on 7 February, added: ‘It is thought by many, that if Mr. Pilkington cannot trim himself, Mrs. Barber will shave him.’\textsuperscript{378} It was common knowledge that Matthew had given information against Barber which had resulted in her arrest. The paper’s provocative play upon Barber’s surname, conjuring the image of the matronly poetess cutting the clergyman Pilkington ‘down to size’, was a deliberate sexual innuendo. \textit{The Post Boy}’s humour belies the stark

\textsuperscript{373} Fischer, ‘The Government Response’, 51.
\textsuperscript{376} Llanover, \textit{The Autobiography and Correspondence of Mary Granville, Mrs. Delany}, 1: 432.
\textsuperscript{377} Swift, Corr. 3: 725.
\textsuperscript{378} \textit{Grub Street Journal}, Thursday 7 February 1734.
reality that the friendship between Matthew and Mary Barber had been permanently severed. On 28 May 1734 Mary Pendarves wrote again to her sister, Ann: ‘Mrs. Barber has not yet finished the troublesome affair that the Pilkingtons’ ingratitude has involved her in.’ The extent of Matthew’s betrayal of Barber sharply contrasts with her earlier support of the young clergyman and his wife. Years before the publication of her Poems, Barber and the Pilkingtons were friends in Dublin. It was Barber who had introduced the couple to Delany and Swift. Matthew even looked on Barber as a patroness in her own right — dedicating two poems to her: ‘The Lost Muse’ and ‘Phoibo-Bathos: or the Poet’s Well’, in his own Poems on Several Occasions (Dublin, 1730). In ‘The Lost Muse’, published in his Poems on Several Occasions (Dublin, 1730), Matthew describes his frustrated search for poetic inspiration, eventually finding it with ‘fair Saphira’ — Mary Barber: ‘As soon convinc’d their wond’ring Eyes, / The Muse was with her in Disguise.’ Barber had subscribed to four copies of Matthew’s Poems on Several Occasions (1730). That same year she served with Constantia as their son Jack’s godmother. As mentioned in Chapter 4, Barber had written to Lady Germain to present Matthew’s collection to the Duke of Dorset in England. One her return to England, she sailed together with Laetitia, who was to visit her husband.

It is likely that Matthew was motivated by Dr Delany and Mary Barber’s earlier failure to deliver a letter from Swift to John Barber recommending Pilkington for the chaplaincy post. Swift sent the letter to Delany and his protégé Mary Barber, who conspired not to deliver it, thus eventually forcing Swift to write a second one. Or that he was motivated by desire to revenge Barber for revealing him to be the author of the Character of
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379 Llanover, The Autobiography and Correspondence of Mary Delany, 1: 473.
380 Matthew Pilkington, Poems on Several Occasions (Dublin, 1730), 77.
382 See Swift’s letter to Alderman John Barber 10 August 1732 in which he admonishes Dr Delany for refusing to give Alderman Barber the letter: ‘Mr Alderman, I am very angry with my friend Dr Delany for not applying to you sooner, as I desired him in favour of Mr Matthew Pilkington… I waited for the Doctrs answer before I would write to you, and it came but last night: He tells me you have been so very kind as to give him a promise upon my request.’ Swift, Corr. 3: 521-22. Newly-wed on 17 July in London Dr Delany was doubtless preoccupied, but he still contrived to lobby Barber as requested by at least 5 August. His letter to Barber is lost.
The publication of *A Genuine Character of John Barber, Esq.; Lord Mayor of London, An. 1733* described John Barber as an avaricious, tight-fisted and proud man who was ‘covetous to a most miserable Degree; with an Eager Desire to be thought the very Reverse. His ‘intimate-Friends, he treats like his Dependants; his Dependants, like his Footmen; and his Footmen, like his Slaves.’ His ‘greatest Favourites are his Flatterers; and his Flatterers are the Nation’s Fools.’ According to the publisher Edmund Curll, the account was delivered in jest and wholly understood as such by Swift who, ‘out of Mirth, read it to Dr. Delany and Mrs. Barber, who also seemed Transported with the Justness of the Character.’ However, according to Matthew Pilkington, it was Mary who was responsible for spreading the account. Pilkington claimed that she ‘expressed so great a Pleasure in hearing it’ was a cleverly disguised ‘Feint’ that ‘was only to induce the Dean to let her read it over Carefully, herself, in a more deliberate Manner.’ Then, having committed the piece to memory, she subsequently ‘wrote as much of it as she could remember, to Mrs. Drelincourt, an Old Gentlewoman, who was a great Intimate of the Lord-Mayor’s, and desired her not only to Read it to him, but to Let him know the Author. Such was the Sincerity of that Female JUDAS.’ On this occasion, Matthew’s betrayal of Barber to the authorities was unwarranted and callous. The friendship would never be repaired. It must have further frustrated Barber that Matthew escaped regular attendance before the King’s Bench and was back in Dublin no later than summer 1734.

Barber was purposeful in managing her public affairs leading up to the publication of her *Poems*. Doubtless, arrest and trial could have been detrimental to her, not only as a poet, but as a woman, putting in her in ‘scandalous’ company such as Delarivier Manley, Aphra Behn and later, Laetitia Pilkington. To avoid gossip Barber took a systematic approach to her
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383 During the time that Pilkington served as Alderman Barber’s chaplain he was simultaneously collecting material for, and in due course, writing and sending to Swift, an abusive ‘Character’ of his employer.

384 *An Impartial History of the Life, Character, Amours, Travels and Transactions of Mr John Barber* (London, 1741), 36-41.
misfortune. Her arrest was not something to be advertised, and her response was to conceal all references to the troublesome event. Her letter to Swift from Conduitt Street makes no mention of her arrest or bail. She refrains from referring to her own (and, by implication, Swift’s) perilous situation. Apart from a few perfunctory, unauthenticated snippets of news on Pope’s health, her letter is almost entirely preoccupied with Henrietta Howard’s dismissal from court, or ‘L[a]dy Suffolks leaving the Qu[ee]n.’ Barber also kept the news of her arrest from close friends, or requested that they keep quiet about the incident. On 10 May, Anne Donnellan wrote to Swift to report that she and her friends would be leaving London shortly, and mentioned in passing that because Barber was bedridden with gout, and had been so since the winter, she would not be able to join them on the seasonal excursion – as if this was the central reason. Moreover, her Preface makes no reference to the arrest and declares herself innocent of all events. She simply states: ‘as those Delays have been occasioned by my Misfortunes, I hope they will not be imputed as my Fault.’ Similarly, there are no explicit references to her arrest, nor her split from the Pilkingtons in Barber’s poems, although the following lines from ‘News from St. James’s’ could easily be applied to Matthew Pilkington’s conduct: ‘He, cringing, owns his Guilt, with Shame; / Yet from himself would shift the Blame.’ So to the lines: ‘Some of my Friends in Death’s cold Arms I see; / Others, tho’ living, yet are dead to me’ are especially resonant, considering Barber’s great friend, Constantia Grierson, had died in 1732, and her estrangement from the Pilkingtons occurred within the next two years. As Matthew’s wife, Laetitia was also guilty by association, and unsurprisingly, neither she nor Matthew feature on Barber’s final subscription list. Similarly there is no mention of either Pilkington in her Preface, or her letter to Swift dated 16 November 1734. Thus, it appears that Barber’s primary concern at this
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387 Barber, Poems, xxv.
388 Barber, Poems, 67.
point was to shift from scandal to prudence and politeness. In this regard the Pilkington couple were unsuitable for exemplary purposes. By severing connections and writing them out of her Poems, Barber implicitly, but categorically, stated that she was not to be associated with the disreputable young couple.

**Publication of Barber’s Poems: Richardson and Rivington**

With the charges against her quashed and the damage to her reputation minimised Barber was free to circulate the subscription edition of her collected Poems. The title page bears the imprint 1734, the date in which it was cast, although it was not circulating until 1735 (see Figure 4). Besides her legal difficulties, which delayed the circulation of the Poems, Barber may have used this delay to make last minute changes to the text, such as writing the Pilkingtons out of it. The quarto was printed by Samuel Richardson (1689–1761), who rose from humble origins in Derbyshire to importance as printer and novelist in London.\(^{389}\) His name does not appear on the title page, but this is not unusual, as according to Maslen, Richardson is named as printer on just eight occasions.\(^{390}\) When Richardson printed Barber’s Poems he was beginning to prosper, largely due to a successful combination of prudence and the ability to diversify his business. He printed newspapers, government tracts, and literary works such as James Thompson’s *The Seasons* and several editions of Daniel Defoe’s *Tour through the Whole Island of Great Britain*. Stephen Duck, *Poems on Several Occasions* (1736), Mary Leapor *Poems on Several Occasions* (1751), Sarah Fielding, *The

---


390 As Keith Maslen has documented, printers (including Samuel Richardson) seldom put their names on the imprint in eighteenth-century London. Instead, during the first two-thirds of the eighteenth century, there flourished a fashion of using printer’s ornaments (head-pieces, tail-pieces, initials, facrotums). The value of these ornaments is heightened when the combination of ornaments within a particular piece of work is considered. Richardson ‘signed’ his books through his habitual use of distinctive hand-cut printer’s ornaments. These may appear on the title, but usually (and as in the case of Mary Barber’s Poems) are spread throughout the body of the text, especially at the beginning and end of chapters, poems, or other text divisions, and provide the chief (and sometimes the only) hope of identifying work from Richardson’s printing house. Keith Maslen, *Samuel Richardson of London Printer: A Study of his Printing Based on Ornament Use and Business Accounts* (Christchurch: University of Otago, 2001), 46
Lives of Cleopatra and Octavia (1757), Elizabeth Carter All the Works of Epictetus (1758).

Mary Chandler’s A Description of Bath (1734).

As noted in Chapter 1, Richardson, who used his letters to promote his fiction through a network of readers and commentators, corresponded regularly with his Irish literary friends. This correspondence included Patrick and Mary Delany, Lady Echlin, Anne Donnellan and Laetitia Pilkington. One of the first books Richardson printed was Poems on Various Occasions (1721) by the Irish clergyman Jonathan Smedley. He printed several of Patrick Delany’s poems and sermons including Revelation examin’d with candour (1732), The Doctrine of Abstinence from Blood defended (1734), An historical account of the life and reign of David, King of Israel, 3 vols. (1739), and Reflections upon Polygamy (1737). Most famously, he printed Swift’s Travels into Several Remote Nations of the World. By Capt. Lemuel Gulliver (1727).

Barber’s Poems highlights the partnership between Richardson and bookseller Charles Rivington (1688–1742). Also from Derbyshire, Rivington came from one of the most important book-trade dynasties in eighteenth-century England. His shop at St. Paul’s Churchyard was the locale of booksellers for divinity and the classics and from 1716 to 1736. His name appeared in the imprints of an average of ten titles per year, about half of which he published jointly with other booksellers. The ‘Rivington-Richardson’ connection may have begun as early as 1724, when both men were involved in the publication of the second edition of Baileys Universal Etymological English Dictionary. In 1739 Rivington and another bookseller, John Osborn, urged Richardson to write a book of familiar letters to serve as

393 On 9 September 1717 he was admitted to the livery of the Stationers' Company and became a member of the Castle Conger, which was to be one of the two most important copyright-holding congers of the 1720s. Its titles included Bailey's Dictionary, Tillotson's Works, Cruden's Concordance, and Jacob's New Law Dictionary. Barbara Laning Fitzpatrick, ‘Rivington family, ODNB.'
models for the use of country people, not only prompting Richardson's *Familiar Letters* (1741), but also inspiring him to write his first novel, *Pamela, or, Virtue Rewarded*, published late in 1740 with the names of the two publishers on the title page. Barber’s quarto is a handsome, gilt-edged folio which used Richardson’s woodcuts adorn the volume throughout. His figure of a cupid and drum, which heralds the opening of her collection on the title page, was also used at the foot of her subscription list. Chapter 3 has demonstrated how Barber’s subscription list acted as paratext signifying the status of her volume. The subscription list of 900 plus names along with Swift’s letter of recommendation to Lord Orrery, Barber’s letter of dedication to Lord Orrery, her preface and poems to patrons and subscribers illustrated that her volume was specifically designed to impress.
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394 Maslen gives a complete list of all ornaments Richardson used throughout Barber’s text. Of the 58 ornaments recorded in use, 52 were used in Barber’s Poems. Maslen, *Samuel Richardson of London, Printer*, 58.
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Fig. 4. The title page to the quarto edition of Mary Barber’s Poems on Several Occasions (1734).
The distribution of Barber’s poems was also strategically orchestrated. On 19 December 1734, the *Daily Journal* announced: ‘Those Persons who have done Mrs. Barber the honour to solicit a subscription for her, and have not yet given in their lists are intreated to send them immediately to Mr. Charles Rivington, bookseller in Saint Paul’s Church-yard. The Books will be delivered to the subscribers the first of next March, or any day after, by the author’s son Rupert Barber at Mr. Pond’s, Painter, in Covent Garden, from ten in the morning to six in the afternoon.’ The *Daily Journal* also highlighted the problem of missing receipts: ‘N.B. Whereas many Receipts have been lost by Persons to whom they were delivered, ’tis hoped those who demand books, whose names are not in the list of subscribers, will not be offended, if they are asked to whom they subscribed.’  

It was inevitable that documentation would be lost in the lengthy wait leading up to the publication of her *Poems* – it is clear that only subscribers can have the book – have to have a connection. Further advertisements followed in the *Daily Courant* and the *Daily Journal* in January 1735.  

Arthur Pond (1701–1758) had cultivated a reputation for his printing, publishing and art dealing in London. He was friends with Pope, Hogarth, George Knapton and Jonathan Richardson Senior. His tour of Italy in 1725 gave him access to important British art patrons with whom he maintained a lucrative trade in old masterworks and art copies. In London, he gave occasional drawing lessons to a limited number of students, mostly well-placed women amateurs. Amongst his earliest students were Mary Pendarves and her cousin Grace Carteret, Countess of Dysart. It was possibly through Pendarves that Barber was first introduced to the artist. Barber quickly engaged him as a master for her son, and also
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396 *Daily Courant* 17 January, 1735, and the *Daily Journal* 7 January; 14 January 1735; Wednesday 4 June 1735.  
managed to secure his subscription to her *Poems*.\textsuperscript{398} Rupert was the first of Pond’s recorded apprentices, and likely entered his studio in June 1735, when Barber made the first half-yearly payment of £7 10s towards her son’s training.\textsuperscript{399}

Barber’s decision to make her *Poems* available for collection at Arthur Pond’s studio, and not at Rivington’s bookshop — the name and address of whom appear in both the quarto and first octavo issues as the sole seller — was a change of plan from the notice in the *Gentleman’s Magazine* July 1733, which requested that subscribers would ‘be pleased to send [their receipts] to Mr Charles Rivington to reserve their copies.’\textsuperscript{400} Budd has interpreted this as an indication that Rivington wished to distance himself from Barber following her arrest. However, this is not entirely plausible. The *Gentleman’s Magazine* requested receipts to be sent to Rivington to reserve copies, but does not necessarily imply collecting them there. Furthermore, as Rivington’s name appears on the subsequent octavo issue, it is less likely that he wished to distance himself from her and more likely that Barber (bedridden with gout) specifically wanted her son, Rupert, to manage the exchange of books. With so many poems dedicated to her sons, it seemed fitting that one of them should be available to present copies of the volume to her subscribers. More importantly, it would help Rupert to meet and greet potential future patrons for his portraits in London. If Barber’s scheme for finding employment for her husband had failed, then she would use this as an opportunity of promoting her son’s career. Writing to Swift from Bath on 3 November 1736 Barber noted Rupert’s successful apprenticeship with Pond in London: ‘My son who is learning to paint


\textsuperscript{399} Pond’s ledgers indicate that Rupert remained under his tutelage through the end of 1739, though further entries confirm that they remained in touch till well after then. Besides learning to paint in oils, Rupert would have worked in pastels, the medium eventually used for three of his Swift’s portraits. Presumably it was during Rupert’s time with him that Pond executed a now untraced portrait of Mary Barber. Folkenflik, ‘The Rupert Barber Portraits’, 41–42.

\textsuperscript{400} *Gentleman’s Magazine*, July 1733.
goes on well and if he be the least approv’d of in all probability he may do very well at Bath for I never yet saw a painter hither, fail of getting more business than he cou’d do let him be ever so indifferent. Clearly Barber’s scheme of introducing Rupert to potential ‘business’ in Pond’s studio the previous year paid off.

Once copies of the quarto had been collected by subscribers, Richardson printed the octavo edition for Rivington, which appeared in June 1735 (see Figure 5). The subscription list was reset and includes several last minute subscribers whose names appeared at the foot of the original 1734 list. For example, the appendix to the quarto lists a ‘Mrs Strode’ as having subscribed for six volumes, where the octavo lists her as having subscribed for only one. The printer has not dropped any names from the quarto’s main list, and even those subscribers who had died since signing their names remain on the list. These included John Gay, who had died on 4 December 1732; Lady Henrietta Countess of Orrery, who had also died in 1732; Frances-Arabella Kelly, who died in November 1733; and Lady Mary, Duchess of Ormond who died that same month. The cupid figure on the quarto edition was replaced with the female figure of Justice, positioned in the centre of the title page. This was a particularly potent choice of symbol, given Barber’s recent release from her embroilment with the London authorities. It indirectly points towards Barber’s ability to balance her work and family, the demands of her subscribers and her personal needs.
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Fig. 5 Title page to the octavo edition of Mary Barber’s Poems on Several Occasions (1735)
The octavo was sold at reduced price of 6 shillings. Richardson’s decision to print an almost identical trade edition in octavo in the same month in which the quarto appeared ensured that readers could purchase a less expensive copy once the quarto volumes were collected. There are no references to Barber’s subscription proposal; neither have we detailed records of Barber’s arrangements with Richardson or her booksellers. Barber’s subscription price was one guinea, but we do not know how many copies of the quarto or octavo sold, nor can we be sure of the average receipt per volume. However, Richardson’s decision was normal period practice. Even Pope, who made remarkable profits from his subscription-works, preferred neat octavo editions to grand quartos and folios. He wrote to Ralph Allen: ‘I have done with expensive Editions for ever, which are only a Complement to a few curious people at the expence of the Publisher, & to the displeasure of the Many ... for the time to come, the World shall not pay, nor make Me pay, more for my Works than they are worth."402

A further octavo edition was printed by Richardson the following spring. This would suggest that there was demand for Barber’s work. The new octavo was announced in The Weekly Miscellany 3 April 1736: ‘This Day are published (neatly printed in Octavo) Poems on Several Occasions by Mrs. Barber’.403 The chief difference between the two octavo editions is that the second edition no longer names Rivington as the sole receiver of the book. Instead it reads ‘Printed for the Author’ (see Figure 5). Budd has argued, that the absence of Rivington’s name on the title page meant that he was not prepared to incur financial loss on Barber’s volume. However, According to Maslen, printing for the author was one of Richardson’s minor, but more visible activities.404 The term derives from the imprint phrase ‘printed for the author’, used to imply that the work was printed at the author’s request and expense rather than on a bookseller’s behalf. The essence of this printing is that the author

403 Weekly Miscellany 3 April 1736.
404 Maslen, Samuel Richardson of London Printer, 36.
undertakes to bear the costs of printing, paper, and distribution. Eventually, the author receives, directly or through his/her printer, the publisher’s account for copies sold, with charges for commission and any expenses incurred, such as advertising. In their biography of Richardson, Eaves and Kimpel note that of the books he printed, ‘A great many of them are the works of friends’. The implication seems to be that hidden inside the tradesman was a gentleman of letters happy to associate with his fellows. Literary scholars, eager to probe Richardson’s creative mental processes, concur that that the output of Richardson’s press substantially reflects his personal concerns and commitments. Richardson often expresses his pleasure in letters shaped for friends and authors; his correspondence shows him forgiving of part of an unpaid bill, but he had no difficulty in rejecting works that were thought not suitable or would cost him time and trouble. The reissue of Barber’s Poems was sold by a conger (syndicate) of eight booksellers which includes Rivington, along with J. Walthoe in Cornhill, J Stagg in West-minster-hall; D. Brown, near Temple-Bar; J. Parker and T. Jackson, in Pall mall; J. Brindley in New-Bondstreet; and J. Leake at Bath. It is likely that Richardson may have persuaded the booksellers to let their names be put on the imprint and to accept some copies for the sale. It is also important to note that seven of the above booksellers had premises at prime locations around London. Bath bookseller, James Leake, is also notable here as Samuel Richardson’s brother-in-law. He also ensured a wider distribution by undertaking to sell Barber’s Poems in Bath.

406 Weekly Miscellany 3 April 1736.
407 In 1719 an association of booksellers entered into partnership for the purpose of printing some expensive works. This ‘conger’ consisted of R. Bonwicke, J. Walthoe, Benjamin and S. Tooke, R. Wilking, T. Ward. In 1736, the firm consisted of Bettesworth, Bonwicke, Ware, A. Ward, Osborn, and Wickstead. A second partnership around the same time consisted of Bettesworth and Rivington who called themselves the ‘New Conger’. See Charles Henry Temperley, The Dictionary of Printers and Printing, with the Progress of Literature Ancient and Modern (London, 1839), 62.
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By Mrs. Barber.

To which is prefix'd,
A Recommendatory Letter from the Rev'd Dr. Swift, Dean of St. Patrick's, to the Right Honourable the Earl of Orrery.

LONDON,
Printed for the Author;
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The Poems’ Reception

It must have been a huge relief for Barber finally to see her poems in circulation. Her ambition had at last been realised and her detractors and critics, as well as staunch supporters and friends, could be presented with her collection. Barber’s Poems appear to have met with a mixed reception which was often subjective and personal. As discussed in Chapter 4, Barber’s Poems were criticised in Bath, largely because certain aristocratic women were not the subject of her praise. Laetitia Pilkington’s savage pronouncement of Barber’s verse: ‘Some of which I fancy might, at this Day, be seen in the Cheesemongers, Chandlers, Pastry-cooks, and Second-hand Bookseller’s Shops’, was also written after Barber had split with the Pilkingtons. Bath subscriber and poet, Mary Chandler was more commendatory. Taking Swift’s continued patronage of Barber’s work as a benchmark of Barber’s quality as a poet she wrote: ‘Swift approves her Lays, / Apollo’s Swift anticipates my Praise.’ The Weekly Miscellany on the octavo reissue also marketed Swift’s letter to Orrery commending her as a ‘true poetical Genius’. More significantly, the paper contains a letter from ‘Your constant Reader, R. W.’ who wrote the following impassioned plea on Barber’s behalf:

I beg you’ll give Place, as you have Opportunity, to the following little pieces written by Mrs. Barber, which I have just transcribed from her Poems in Octavo just published; and which, as that Lady appears to me by her Works, to be a serious and judicious Writer, and preserves a Purity of Stile and Sentiment entirely worthy of the Muse, I think will be a far from being a Discredit to the Weekly Miscellany copy; And as I intend no Harm to the worthy Author, may be a Means, perhaps, of making her Works better known, which they seem to me highly to deserve.

We cannot conclusively verify the gender of the author of this review. The initials ‘R. W.’ may refer to Mr. Richard Wilson (c.1713–82) a landscape painter from Penegoes, Wales,
who subscribed to Barber’s Poems. Wilson, who was apprenticed to portraitist Thomas Wright in London in 1729, had a reputation as a fashionable man about town. His growing success as a ‘Society Portrait Painter’ enabled him to move to a larger, comfortable studio in Covent Garden Piazza – near to Arthur Pond’s studio. It is possible that he picked up a copy of Barber’s Poems there.411 Doubtless his description of Barber’s poetry as ‘serious’, ‘judicious’, with a ‘purity of Stile’ and ‘Sentiment worthy of the Muse’ would have pleased Barber who claimed:

The Muse I never have debas’d
My Lays are innocent at least;
Were ever ardently design’d
To mend and to enlarge the Mind.
This must be own’d a virtuous Aim.
The Praise of Wit — let others claim.412

Despite the difficulties of pleasing a fickle subscribing public, Barber’s primary objective had been achieved in the publication of her Poems. She also achieved her ambition of residing at Bath with her two younger children, Mira and Lucius. It appears that her husband, Rupert Snr remained in Dublin at this time. In a letter to Swift on 7 January 1736, Mary Pendarves wrote: ‘Bath is full of people. Such as they are; none worth giving you any account of; my solace is Mrs. Barber, whose spirit and good countenance cheers me whenever I hear or see her; she is at present pretty well.’413 Swift offered to take care of her in Ireland, Barber wished to remain in Bath, even if she was pressed to maintain herself and her children. Writing to Swift from Bath on 3 November 1736 she pointed to the importance of fostering connections for her children as her chief focus: ‘the interest of my children is a great inducement to me for here I have the best prospect of keeping up an acquaintance for

412 Barber, Poems, 283.
413 Swift Corr., 4: 250.
them."\(^{414}\) Although she was unable ‘to pursue the scheme of letting Lodgings’, she was ‘desirous to try if I can do any good by selling Irish Linnen which I find is comeing [sic] much into repute here.’\(^{415}\) Her final request of her patron Swift was the rights to the English edition of his \textit{Complete Collection of Genteel and Ingenious Conversation} ‘and a few of your original poems’. In the \textit{Polite Conversation} — a sequel to his \textit{A Proposal for correcting, improving and ascertaining the English Tongue} (London, 1712), Swift advocated that an authority be set up to preserve what is good and resist what is bad in terms of language.\(^{416}\) It consists of three satirical dialogues at breakfast, dinner and tea, presented as a guide to ‘Genteel and Ingenious Conversation, According to the Most Polite Method Now Used at Court, and in the Best Companies of England.’ The text is full of catch-phrases, colloquialisms, oaths, exclamations, greetings and farewells. It was appropriate that Barber was accorded the rights to this work, especially given her experience with the fashionable elite at The Wells, Bath and London. As she explained to Swift: ‘every body wou’d gladly subscribe for anything Dr Swift wrote and indeed Sir I believe in my conscience it wou’d be the making of me.’\(^{417}\)

Swift had the Earl of Orrery hand-deliver a manuscript of his \textit{A Complete Collection of Genteel and Ingenious Conversation} and authorised her to have it published to her own benefit at London. In a letter to Orrery on 1 June 1737 Swift wrote: ‘The Papers you will please take with you for Dr K[ing] at Oxford, are all corrected, and may be bundled up in twenty Minutes.’\(^{418}\) This bundle included the manuscript of the \textit{Polite Conversation} for Mary Barber, and holograph letters of Pope’s being returned at his request, as a letter from Orrery

\(^{414}\) \textit{Swift Corr.}, 4: 250.  
\(^{415}\) \textit{Swift Corr.}, 4: 251.  
\(^{416}\) ‘They will find, said Swift, many words that deserve to be utterly thrown out of the language, many more to be corrected, and perhaps not a few long since antiquated, which ought to be restored on account of their energy and sound.’ Jonathan Swift, \textit{A Proposal for correcting, improving and ascertaining the English tongue} (London, 1712), 30-1.  
\(^{417}\) \textit{Swift Corr.}, 4: 251.  
\(^{418}\) \textit{Swift Corr.}, 4: 436.
to Swift 23 July 1737 observed: ‘Dr King has his cargo, Mrs. Barber her conversation, and Mr. Pope his letters.’ The London edition of Swift’s *Polite Conversation* appeared seven months later. It was printed by Richardson and sold by Swift’s long-standing and recently prosecuted London bookseller, Benjamin Motte and C. Bathurst. The Dublin edition was overseen by Swift. Swift’s agreement to authorise Barber as proprietor to the work in London, publicly proved his continued endorsement of the poet.

The events leading up to the printing of Barber’s *Poems* posed an inevitable financial and personal cost to Barber; however, that she managed to accomplish her aims and triumph over continuing ill-health and her arrest, was a striking personal achievement. On the one hand, the events leading up to the publication of her *Poems* was punctuated by series of challenges including a protracted subscription, ill health, arrest, court summons and the betrayal of a close friendship with the Pilkingtons all of which undermined and complicated Barber’s progress. Her health, in particular, continually plagued her for the rest of her life. On the other hand, it cannot be denied that the fact that she had surmounted these challenges with initiative was a significant achievement in her own time. She secured the printing and selling of her poem by the fast-growing, important partnership of Richardson-Rivington. Within the space of two years, her *Poems* ran to three editions. She orchestrated the distribution of her *Poems* from Pond’s studio so that her son, Rupert, might benefit in making potential connections. Her personal goal, which was to advance her children’s prospects and maintain a modest involvement in genteel society, was also realised as she settled for a time in ‘genteel’ Bath.

Moreover, the publication of Barber’s *Poems* has shown how she took a strategic approach to managing her public persona: She concealed her arrest in her Preface and

---


420 The differences between the Dublin and London editions are extensive. The Dublin text contains Faulkner’s ‘improvements’, and there are other rewritings.
decisively cut ties with the Pilkingtons when that relationship did not serve her. Instead she turned her attention to maintaining the support of her patrons Swift, Delany, Orrery and Mary Pendarves. Securing the rights to Swift’s *Polite Conversation* cemented Barber’s connection to polite circles following the publication of her *Poems* and affirmed his continuing support. Rather than succumb to the limitations and restrictions of considerable obstacles, Barber showed that she was an example of a woman writer who mixed business acumen and print to survive.
Conclusion

Barber’s subscription method is a testament to how women could and did engage with patrons and subscribers in order to access print culture in the early eighteenth century. This thesis has demonstrated that her achievement resulted from her discernment and sensitivity to patronage and subscription processes. Through a sophisticated understanding of the cultural field Barber managed her subscription in England so as to profit from the patronage connections she had previously established in Ireland. Thus, as this thesis has asserted, her achievement must be viewed in relation to her earlier literary and patronage relationships; not only in terms of the poems she wrote, but in the ways in which she negotiated the complexities of patronage, which, in turn, resulted in the broad base of support for her collection. The enduring nature of that endorsement is evidenced by the fact that despite numerous setbacks, Barber saw her *Poems* into print and maintained the support of her patrons Delany and Swift.

In practical terms, the process required a tremendous amount of time and energy on behalf of the author and her friends. By 1737, Barber’s patron, Lord Orrery, wrote to her with regret that ‘the Gout and Rheumatism have got possession of your hands and feet, and melancholy and languor your heart and head’. In the same letter he commented sceptically on her quixotic scheme of going to Georgia (about which, unfortunately, nothing more is known), and suggested that a return to Ireland might benefit her health. By 1742, Barber and her children had returned to Ireland and rejoined her husband. There, she could be cared for

---

by her sons Constantine and Rupert. That same year, Mary, Rupert Snr., Constantine, Rupert Jr. and Mira all subscribed to the collected Poems of English enlightenment figure and poet, John Winstanley (1677–1747), printed in Dublin that year.

The Dublin circle had also greatly altered since Barber had left for England in 1732. Her friends and supporters, Constantia Grierson, and the young Frances-Arabella Kelly had died. By this time, Barber had also fallen out with the Pilkingtons. By 1738, Swift had become reclusive and increasingly inaccessible even to his closest friends. Plagued by deafness and a gradual loss of memory, his health had deteriorated further by the time the Barbers returned to Dublin, in large part the apparent result of a series of minor strokes that led to aphasia. He also suffered from a painful and disfiguring case of orbital cellulitis. After 1742, Swift’s care fell under a committee of trustees who succeeded in making his isolation even more complete. With bitterness, Delany would recall those about him, notably his cousin Mrs Whiteaway and her son Deane Swift, who sought ‘by all the evil arts of insinuation and untruth, to banish the Dean’s best friends from about him, and make a monopoly of him to themselves. And they in great measure affected it.’ However, there was some good news in March 1742, when Barber’s son, Rupert married Bridget Wilson, Patrick Delany’s niece. She was also reunited with Mary Pendarves when she returned to Delville in 1744, following the Pendarves’s marriage to Delany in June 1743. Barber was cheerful during her visit with the Delanys in 1744, Mary Delany reported, although ‘she had the gout upon her and had to be lifted out upon men’s shoulders’.

---

422 Recent research conducted by O’Doherty in the Glasnevin area reveals that the Barber family lived at ‘Carlingford House’ (or ‘Florence Court’ as it is named in the 1738 Dublin Directory) until 1804, and not at the bottom of Delanys’ Delville garden as many historians believe. The site is now occupied by the River Garden Apartments, near the Botanical Gardens in Glasnevin. Tony O’Doherty, ‘Glasnevin Village in the 18th Century: The Parish Alms House and the Parish School’, Dublin Historical Record, 59 (Autumn 2006): 137.
423 John Wistanley, Poems written by John Wistanley (Dublin, 1742). Other subscribers included Swift, Delany and Pope.
425 Elias, Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington, 2: 393.
426 Llanover, The Autobiography and Correspondence of Mary Delany, 3: 280.
October 1745, Barber presented the same medal he had bequeathed her in his will to Mary Delany.\textsuperscript{427} Barber’s own health declined over the following decade and, on 24 June 1755, Pendarves reported Barber’s recent death: ‘which affected both the Dean [Delany] and me very much.’\textsuperscript{428} Her death was also noted in the \textit{Dublin Journal} on 14 June 1755.\textsuperscript{429}

This thesis has questioned the received view of Barber and her subscription practice in order to provide a complete picture of her literary aims and its relevance to our understanding of women’s publishing. To think of Barber’s collection of poems in terms of her preferred mode of publication is not to claim for her an exalted place among the women poets of the eighteenth century. Barber herself did not seek literary immortality. Instead, I argue, that her significance lies in her exemplary status as a female poet who published by subscription in this period. This dissertation has illuminated how, through an understanding of patronage and print practice, she manipulated poetry in order to court patrons and subscribers. Her engagement with Delany’s dedication of \textit{The Birth of Manly Virtue} to Lord Carteret won for her the support of Lord Carteret and a place in Delany’s Dublin coterie. Her poetic petition to Lady Carteret on behalf of an army officer’s widow, achieved the wider patronage of the Carteret family. Her literary friendship with Grierson shows how mutually supportive friendship complemented and served the imaginative and practical interests of women writers. This is particularly reflected in their poetic engagement regarding their sons which, in turn, enabled Barber to reinforce her maternal authority and endorse her own poetry. Together the pair also approached Martha Percival through verse, resulting in further support from the Percival family for Barber’s \textit{Poems}. In England, Barber demonstrated her awareness of the nuances of polite culture by adhering to form and deference in her poetry. Contrary to previous critical assessments of Barber as an indifferent, sycophantic versifier, this thesis has demonstrated that she was sensitively attuned to the nuances of the cultural

\textsuperscript{427} Swift \textit{Corr.}, 3: 206.
\textsuperscript{428} Llanover, \textit{The Autobiography and Correspondence of Mrs. Delany}, 3: 356.
field in which she was operating. In a world that was vertically organised and prosperous, politeness in all its forms, and particularly in poetry, proved a highly useful tool for understanding, negotiating and organising support. Barber’s ability to pen polite, occasional verse — often extemporaneously and under pressure — was a skill in itself. It also reflects a story that gave texture to her life and a society that was characterised by rising expectations of material comfort and social mobility.

This thesis has also demonstrated how Barber’s success in procuring this support resulted from a combination of business acumen and sustained effort. Over the three years it took her to complete her subscription, she encountered ill-health, delays in correspondence, the treachery of close friends, arrest and a protracted court summons. Throughout, she maintained her strategic approach, dextrously managing her patrons and her public persona in order to transcend the limitations and restrictions imposed by these considerable obstacles. Her determination and skill won for her a two-fold triumph: to see her poems successfully into print and to fashion a better life for herself and her family.
Appendix 1

THE PREFACE.

'Tis to be hope'd the courteous Reader will not be displeas'd with any Remain of so fame'd an Author as Callimachus, even in a Translation. His particular Turn was Panegyric, and 'tis evident Propertius believed he excell'd in it, when he wish'd to attain no higher Honour in Poetry than the Glory of imitating our Author's Manner with Success: as appears from one of the Lemma's prefix to this Translation, which I shall
The PREFACE.
I shall beg leave to explain in the following Manner, for the Benefit of my fair Readers.

Great Bard, of matchles Art and Ease,
Polite Artificer of Praise,
My vainest Wish were but to shine
In courtly Lays resembling thine.
THE

Birth of Manly Virtue,

FROM

CALLIMACHUS.

Inter Callimachi sat erit placuiffe Libellus,
Et cecinisse modis, pure Poeta, tuis. Propert.
Grantor & pulchro veniens in corpore virtus.
Virg. Æn. V.

ONCE on a Time, a righteous Sage,
Grive'd at the Vices of the Age,
Apply'd to Jove with fervent Prayer;
"O Jove, if Virtue be so fair
As it was deem'd in former Days
By Plato, and by Socrates,
(Whole Beauties mortal Eyes escape,
Only for want of outward Shape)
Make thou its real Excellence
For once the Theme of human Sense.
So shall the Eye, by Form coul'd,
Direct, and fix the wandring Mind,
And long-deluded Mortals see,
With Rapture, what they wont to flee.

JOV E grants the Prayer, gives Virtue Birth,
And bids him blest, and mend the Earth;
Behold him blooming, fresh, and fair,
Now made, — ye Gods! — a Son and Heir,
An Heir? and Stranger yet to hear,
An Heir and Orphan of a Peer;
But Prodigies are wrought to prove
Nothing impossible to Jove.

Virtue was of this Sex design'd,
In mild Reproof to Woman-kind;
2. The Birth of Manly Virtue.

In manly Form to let them see
The Loveliness of Modesty,
The thousand Decencies that shine
With less’ned Lustre in their own;
Which few had learnt enough to prize,
And some thought modish to despise.

To make his Merit more discern’d,
He goes to School! he reads! is learn’d!
Rais’d high above his Birth by Knowledge,
He shines distinguis’d in a College;
Refolv’d, nor honour, nor Estate,
Himself alone shou’d make him great.
Here, soon for every Art renown’d,
His influence is diffus’d around;
Th’ inferior Youth, to Learning led
Less to be fam’d, than to be fed,
Behold the Glory he has won,
And blufh to be so far out-done:
And now, inflame’d with rival Rage,
In scientific Strife engage;
Engage, and in the glorious Strife,
The Arts new kindle into Life.

HERE would our Hero ever dwell,
Fix’d in a lonely, learned Cell,
Contented to be truly great,
In Virtue’s best belov’d Retreat;
Contented he, but Fate ordains
He now shall shine in nobler Scenes:
(Rais’d high like some celestial Fire
’T’o shine the more still rising higher)
Compleatly form’d in every Part,
To win the Soul, and glad the Heart;
The powerful Voice, the graceful Mien,
Lovely alike, or heard or seen;
His outward Form, and Inward, vie,
His Soul bright beaming from his Eye,
Ennobling every Act, and Air,
With Jull, and Generous, and Sincere.

Accomplish’d thus, his next Resort
Is to the Council, and the Court;
The Birth of Manly Virtue.

Where Virtue is in least Repute,
and interest the one Pursuit,
Where Right, and Wrong, are bought and sold;
Are't for Beauty, and for Gold;
Yet Manly Virtue even here
Was'd in the Person of a Peer;
Peer, a scarcely bearded Youth,
Who talk'd of Justice, and of Truth,
Of Innocence, the fairest Guard,
Tales here forgot are yet unheard;
That he alone deserv'd Esteem,
Who was the Man, he wish'd to seem;
All'd it unmanly and unwise
To lurk behind a mean Disguise;
Give fraudulent Vice the Mask and Screen,
To Virtue's Interest to be seen:)
All'd want of Shame, a want of Sense,
And found in Blushes, Eloquence.
Thus, acting what he taught so well,
He drew dumb Merit from her Cell,
Instruct'd with amazing Art along
The path of Dame, and look'd her tongue:
And whilst he made her Value known,
In more display'd, and rais'd his own.
Thus young, thus proof to all Temptations,
Rises to the highest Stations;
For, where high Honour is the Prize,
Virtue has a Right to rise.)
A courtly slave, low bend the Knee.
Wealth and Vice, in high Degree,
Fulfilled Worth disclaims to owe
Grandeur to its greatest Foe.
Now rais'd on high, see, Virtue shews
The Godlike Ends for which he rose;
From him let proud Ambition know,
The Height of Glory here below,
And, by Goodness made compleat!
Blest is truly to be great!
Taught, how Men to Honours rise,
Be guided Vapours to the Skies,
The Birth of Manly Virtue:
Which, howsoever they display
Their Glory from the God of Day,
Their noblest Use is to abate
His dangerous Excess of Heat,
To shield the infant Fruits and Flowers,
And bless the Earth with genial Showers.
Now change the Scene; a nobler Care
Demands him in an higher Sphere;
Dittrels of Nations calls him hence,
Permitted so by Providence;
For Models, made to mend our Kind,
To no one Clime shou'd be confin'd;
And Manly Virtue, like the Sun,
His Course of glorious Toil shou'd run,
Alike diffusing in his Flight
Congenial Joy, and Life, and Light.
Pale Envy fickens—— Erreur flies——
And Discord, in his Presence, dies——
Oppression hides, with guilty Dread,
And Merit rears her drooping Head;
The Arts revive, the Valleys sing,
And Winter softens into Spring:
The wond'ring World, where'er he moves,
With new Delight looks up and loves;
One Sex consenting to admire,
Nor lets the other to desire;
Whilst he, throned on a Throne,
Confines his Faith to one alone;
The rest condemn'd, with rival Voice,
Repling, to applaud his Choice.
Fame now reports, the western Isle
Is made his Mansion for a while;
Whose anxious Natives, Night and Day,
(Happy beneath his righteous Sway)
Weary the Gods with ceaseless Prayer,
To bless him and to keep him there;
And claim it as a Debt from Fate,
Too lately found! to lose him late! 
Laetitia Pilkington, *A Poem Inscrib’d to the Author of The Birth of Manly Virtue* (1725)\(^{430}\)

A Poem Inscribed to the Author
of *The Birth of Manly Virtue*

Anonymous

*Mente vigenti*

Avia Pieridum peragras loca, nullius ante
Tritia solo; juvat integros accedere fonts,
Atque haucire; juvatque novos decerpere flores,
Insignemque tuo capiti petere inde coronam,
Unde prius nulli velarint tempora Musae.\(^{431}\)

Hail happy Bard, who durst explore
A path, which Muse ne’er traced before:
A path would better show a God
Than e’en Callimachus e’er trod!
New is the thought and bold the flight,
Like that of Phoebus, heavenly bright,
When first his orient light he shed
On a new world, and bid it spread.
The light obeyed and straight a scene
Of glorious imag’ry was seen.
Nor less thy power, nor less thy skill,
To show new wonders at thy will.
Others imagine they excel,
If they can only copy well,
Or paint a grove, or lover’s dream,
A flow’ry mead, or limpid stream.
Thou, from thy native depth of thought
Hast goodliest ore to polish wrought,
Burnished the lass and bid it shine
With brilliant beam and ray divine.
Wond’rous the work! But true the theme—
Virtue and Carteret are the same.


\(^{431}\) Lucretius Book 1, lines 925-930. The Loeb Classical Library translation by W. H. D. Rouse reads, ‘now in lively thought I traverse pathless tracts of the Pierides never yet trodden by any foot. I love to approach virgin springs and there to drink; I love to pluck fresh flowers, and to seek an illustrious chaplet for my head from fields whence ere this the Muses have crowned the brows of none’ (69). See Robert Hogan, *The Poems of Patrick Delany*, 102.
To His Excellency the Lord Carteret, Occasioned by Seeing a Poem Entitled *The Birth of Manly Virtue*[^32]

*Mary Barber*

The picture strikes—'tis drawn with wond'rous art;  
Well has the poet played the painter's part.  
Though 'tis your glory, yet, my Lord, I own,  
I grieve the features fit yourself alone.  
But know, though all agree the picture's yours,  
'Tis steadiness alone your claim secures.  
With pleasure now your image you survey;  
But should you from the rules of virtue stray,  
Should e'er degrading vice deform your frame,  
You'd start, like Io from the crystal stream.

When Kneller has displayed with matchless grace  
The fleeting glories of Clarinda's face,  
She sighs, to think how time will soon devour  
The lovely bloom which gives her now such power;  
But yours, a likeness of a nobler kind,  
Displays the deathless beauties of the mind;  
Be it your glory to surpass the paint,  
And make the finished picture look too faint.

Why is he hid, who with such matchless art,  
Calls forth the graces that adorn your heart?  
True poets in their deathless lays should live,  
And share that immortality they give.

POEMS
ON
SEVERAL OCCASIONS.

To the Hon: M/s Carteret, now Countess of Dysert.*

AIR Innocence, the Muse's loveliest Theme,
On Acts of Mercy found thy rising Fame:
Let Others from frail Beauty hope Applause,
Plead Thou the Fatherless, and Widow's Cause;
Fly to your Mother, let each winning Grace
Engage Compassion for my helpless Race:

* Written when the Lord Carteret was Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and ran with the Widow Gordon's Petition.
2 POEMS

So shall the wond'ring World be taught from thence,
Beauty is but your Second Excellence.

The Widow Gordon's Petition*:

To the Right Hon. the Lady Carteret.

WEARY'D with long Attendance on the Court,
You, Madam, are the Wretch's last Refort.
Eternal King! if Here in vain I cry,
Where shall the Fatherless, and Widow fly?

How blest are they, who sleep among the Dead,
Nor hear their Childrens' piercing Cries for Bread!

When your lov'd Off-spring gives your Soul Delight,
Reflec't, how mine are irksome to my Sight:
O think, how muft a wretched Mother grieve,
Who hears the Want she never can relieve!

* Written for an Officer's Widow.

AN
On several Occasions.

An Evil preys upon my helpless Son,
(How many ways the Wretched are undone!)
Cruel Distemper, to assault his Sight,
And rob him of his only Joy, the Light!
His Anguish makes my wearied Eyes overflow,
And loads me with unutterable Woe.

No Friendly Voice my lonely Mansion cheers,
All fly th' Infection of the Widow's Tears:
Ev'n those, whose Pity eas'd my Wants with Bread,
Are now, O fad Reverse! my greatest Dread.
My mournful Story will no more prevail,
And ev'ry Hour I dread a dismal Jail:
I start at each imaginary Sound,
And Horrors have encompass'd me around.

Tremble, ye Daughters, who at Ease recline,
Left ye should know a Misery like mine.
4 POEMS

Ye now, unmov'd, can hear the Wretched moan,
And feel no Wants, yourselves oppress'd by none;
Fly from the Sight of Woes, ye will not share,
And leave the helpless Orphan to despair.
But know, that dreadful Hour is drawing near,
When you'll be treated, as you've acted here:
To you no more the Wretched shall complain,
'Twill be your Turn to weep, and sue in vain.

Not so the Fair, with God-like Mercy bless'd,
Who feels another's Anguish in her Breast;
Who never hears the Wretched sigh in vain,
Herself distress'd, till she relieves their Pain.

This, Fame reports, Fair Carteret, of You;
This blest Report encourag'd me to sue.
O Angel Goodness, hear, and ease my Moan,
Nor let your Mercy fail in me alone!
So at the last Tribunal will I stand,
With my poor Orphans, plac'd on either Hand;

There,
On several Occasions.

There, with my Cries, my Saviour I'll assail;
(For at His Bar the Widow's Tears prevail)
That she, who made the Fatherless her Care,
The Fulness of Celestial Joys may share;
That She a Crown of Glory may receive,
Who snatch'd me from Destruction and the Grave.
6 POEMS

Written in the Conclusion of a Letter to Mr. Tickell, entreatyng him to recommend the Widow Gordon's Petition.

ETERNAL King, is there one Hour,
   To make me greatly bless'd!
When shall I have it in my Pow'r
   To succour the Distress'd?

In vain, alas! my Heart o'erflows
   With useless Tenderness;
Why must I feel Another's Woes,
   And cannot make them less?

Yet I this Torture must endure;
   'Tis not reserv'd for me,
To ease the Sighing of the Poor,
   Or set the Prisoners free.
Appendix 2.1: Subscription List to Barber’s *Poems on Several Occasions* (1734). Source: Eighteenth-Century Collections Online
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Rev. Dr. Cotterel, Dean of  
Raphoe, 6 Books  
Mrs. Campbel  
Rev. Mr. Caryth  
--- --- Clayton, Esq;  
--- --- Crofe, Esq;  
John Conduit, Esq;  
Francis Clark, Esq;  
Mrs. Conduit  
Francis Chute, Esq;  
Mrs. Crawford  
Mrs. Diana Cook  
Mrs. Elizabeth Carleton  
Mrs. Elizabeth Critp  
Mrs. Cartharine Chichester  
--- --- Coults, M. D.  
Colthrope Clayton, Esq;  
Alexius Clayton, Esq;  
Mrs. Ursula Crompton  
Mr. Robert Cowel  
Mrs. Elizabeth Crompton  
Mr. Thomas Carte  
Mrs. De Cuna  
Mrs. Cottrel  
Mrs. Campion  
Mrs. Juliana Cotty  
Mrs. Cockburn  
Mrs. Jane Cottrel  
William Cleland, Esq;  
Reverend Mr. Cook, A. M.  
Cornelius Callaghan, Esq;  
Mrs. Chandler, of Bath  
Mrs. Clavering  
Mrs. Cannon  
Mrs. Crowly  
Mrs. Hannah Clements  
Mrs. Elizabeth Clements  
Mrs. Cathel  
Mr. John Chantry  
Mr. Daniel Collier  
Mr. Alexander Conyngham  
Mr. Michael Cornic  
Mr. Cronie  
Mr. John Cook  
Mrs. Alice Clarke  
Mr. Daniel Conyngham, Merchant.  
Mr. Edward Curtis.

Duke of Dorset, Lord Lieutenant  
of Ireland, 10 Books  
Duchefs of Devonshire  
Countesfs of Deloraine  
Countesf Dowager of Donneggall  
Countesf of Donneggall  
Lady Viscountes Downrayle  
Right Hon. Lady Anne Dowglafs  
Lady De Lareure  
Lord Archbishops of Dublin  
Honourable Mrs. Diana Dawfon  
Lord Bishop of Derry  
Honourable Mrs. Anne Donnellan  
Rev. Dr. Delany, 10 Books  
Honourable Mrs. Devereux  
Honourable Colonel Dallaway  

Lord
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Lord Dunkerron
Honourable - - - - Digby, Esq;
Right Hon. George-Bubb Dodgington, Esq;
Sir Matthew Decker
Mrs. Charlotte Davenant
Anthony Duncombe, Esq;
Rev. Mr. Donnellan, Fellow of T. C. D.

Mrs. Sophia Duncombe
Mr. Duffkin
Mrs. Sarah Duffkin
Mrs. Drelincourt, 2 Books
Mrs. Anne Drelincourt, 2 Books
Rev. Mr. Philip Downs
Mrs. Downs
Major General Dornet
Colonel Disney

Mrs. Dives
Mrs. Anne Donnellan
Francis Dayrell, Esq;
James Dowgles, Esq;
Whittred Doyne, Esq;

Sir Germyn Davers, Bart.
Peter Daly, Esq;
Peter Delme, Esq;
Mrs. Jane Delme
Mrs. Anne Delme
John Duncombe, Esq;
Mr. William Duncombe
Mrs. Anne Don
Mrs. Catharine Daly
Gibson Dalzelli, Esq;

Mrs. Dillon
Miss Dillon
Mr. Durell
- - - - Dodd, M. D.
- - - - Dalton, Esq;
Mr. William Dunkin, A. M.
Mrs. Drake
Mrs. Sarah Deacon.

Mrs. Dashwood
Mrs. H. Dunch
Miss Dean
Miss Dollin
Mr. William Douglas
Mr. William Dob
Mrs. Dob
Capt. John Dawson
Mr. Delacourt, A. B.

Earl of Essex
Earl of Egmont
Countess of Egmont
Lady Viscount Eketon
Sir Robert Ecklin, Bart.
Sir John Eyles, Bart.
Hon. Mrs. Eyre, of Eyse-Court
Mrs. Edwin
Robert Elwis, Esq;
Rev. Mr. Sloan Eismore
Charles Ecklin, Esq;
Richard Evelyn, Esq;
Mrs. Mary Edwards, 2 Books:
- - - - Edgcombe, Esq;
Mrs. Eyre, 2 Books
Mrs. Elliot
Mrs. Earnly
Simon Eris, Esq;
Sir Joseph Eyles

Countess of Ferrers
Right Hon. Lady Elizabeth Finch
Lady Viscountess Fitzwilliams
Lady Folliot

Lord
A List of the Subscribers.

Lord Foley
Hon. - - - Finch, Esq.
Hon. William Finch, Esq.
Sir Thomas Frankland, Bart.
Sir Andrew Fontaine
Sir John Frederick
Hon. Col. Fane
Rev. Dr. Freind
Mrs. Fullerton
Mrs. Biddy Floyd
John Frederick, Esq.
Mrs. Fellows, 3 Books
Warden Flood, Esq.
Robert French, Esq.
Thomas Frederick, Esq.
James Fox, Esq.
Mrs. Freeman, Jun.
Mrs. Foffer
Richard Fitzgerald, Esq.
Matthew Fitzgerald, Esq.
Mr. George Faulkner
Mrs. Sarah Forster
Mrs. - - - Floyd
Mrs. - - - Floyd
Mrs. Elizabeth Forth
Mr. James Flack
Mr. Richard Fitzgerald
Mrs. Favor
Matthew Ford, Esq. of Searford
Rev. Mr. Ford, Fellow of T.C.D.
Mrs. Ford
James Forth, Esq.
John Foulke, Esq.
Mr. Thomas Finlay
Mr. John French
Mr. James Flemming
Nathaniel Ford, Esq.
William Foundes, Esq.
Capt. Foliot
Mrs. Dorothy Fellows, 3 Books
Mr. John Ferret

Duke of Grafton
Countess of Gainsborough
Countess of Granville
Earl of Granard
Countess of Granard
Lady Guilford
Lady Glenorchy
Right Honourable Lady Elizabeth Germain, 5 Books
Lord Gage
Lady Gage
Right Hon. Lady Mary Godolphin
Lord Gower
Hon. William-Leveson Gower
Sir Arthur Gore, Bart.
Sir Samuel Garrard, Bart.
Barnard Granville, Esq.
Mrs. Anne Granville
Reverend Mr. John Gratton
Oliver Saint-George, Esq.
Richard Gearing, Esq.; 2 Books
Mr. John Gay
Mr. Sergeant Garrard
James Gratton, M. D.
Burrington Goldsworthy, Esq.
Mrs. Anne Gacoyne
Mrs. Margaret Gacoyne
Edward Griffith, Esq.
Crup Gacoyne, Esq.
Mr. Bamber Gacoyne
Mr. George Grierfom
Mr. Garnier Jun. 2 Books
Mrs. Garnier
Mrs. Mary Gordon
Mr. John Gacoyne
Mr. William Gardiner
Mr. Theophilus Glover

Mr.
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Mr. William Gavin  
Mrs. Jane Gavin  
Mr. Gurney  
Mr. Gill, of Chelsea  
Mrs. Hafter George  
Joseph Gafcoyne, Esq;  
Francis Guybon, Esq;  

- - - - - Campbell Hamilton, Esq;  
Mrs. Campbell Hamilton  
John Hanbury, Esq;  5 Books  
William Hanbury, Esq;  
- - - - - Harper, Esq;  
Walter Hungerford, Esq;  
Hon. Governor Hart  
Mrs. Hill  
Mr. Edward Herbert  
Mrs. Hanger  
Mr. John Hayes  
Mrs. Anne Hayes  
Arthur Hill, Esq;  
Rowly Hill, Esq;  
Rev. Dr. Harbin  
- - - - - Hamilton, of Callidon  
Nathaniel Hook, Esq;  
Mr. Hamner  
Mr. Thomas Hall, Merchant  
Mr. John Howison  
Mrs. Heathcote, of Windfor  

H  

Earl of Hertford  
Counts of Hertford, 5 Books  
Counts of Harrold  
Earl of Halifax  
Right Honourable Lady Archibald Hamilton  
Right Hon. Lady Anne Harvey  
Honourable Thomas Harvey, Esq;  
Right Hon. Lady Catharine Hyde  
Right Hon. Lady Charlotte Hyde  
Right Hon. Lady Elizabeth Hatlings  
Right Hon. Lady Frances Hatlings  
Right Hon. Lady Anne Hatlings  
Right Hon. Lady Elizabeth Herbert  
Right Hon. Lady Rebecca Herbert  
Right Hon. Lady Anne Harvey  
Honourable Thomas Harvey, Esq;  
Lady Hardwick  
Lady Harcourt  
Sir Thomas Hamner, Bart. 2 Books  
Lady Hamner, 5 Books  
Honourable Mrs. Sophia Hamilton  
Honourable Mrs. Hamilton  
Richard Hellham, M. D. 5 Books  
Mrs. Hellham  
Lady Harper  
Roger Hamilton, Esq;  
Mrs. Harrition  
George Hart, Esq;  
Reverend Dr. Hales  

- - - - - Hamilton, of Callidon  
Nathaniel Hook, Esq;  
Mr. Hamner  
Mr. Thomas Hall, Merchant  
Mr. John Howison  
Mrs. Heathcote, of Windfor  

I  

Right Hon. Lady Catharine Jones, 2 Books  
Earl of Inchiquin  
Counts Dowager of Inchiquin  
Right Honourable Sir Joseph Jekyll, Master of the Rolls  
Hon. Lady Jekyll  
Sir John Jocelyn, Bart. of Hideway in Hertfordshire  
Hon. Brigadier General Jones  
Robert Jocelyn, Esq; Attorney General of Ireland  
Mrs. Jenkinson  
Talbot Ivory, Esq;  
James James, Esq;  3 Books  

Mr.  
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Mr. Joye
Richard Johnston, Esq.
William Jennings, Esq.
Mrs. Jennings
Mr. Philip Jennings
Robert Johnston, Esq.
Thomas Johnston, Esq.
Mr. Francis Jones
Rev. Dr. Jackson, of St. Michians

Mrs. Jackson
Mrs. Jackson, of Southwark
- - - - Jackson, Esq.
Mrs. Jackson
Mr. John Jackson
Mr. Jacob Jackson, of T. C. D.
Mrs. Sarah Jackson
Mrs. Jones
Mr. Francis Jones
Mrs. Lucy Johnston
Mr. Henry Johnston

Alderman Kendal
Arthur Knox Esq.
Mr. John Knox
Alderman Gilbert King
- - - - Knight, Esq.
Mr. Charles Knapton
Mrs. Kendal

Marchioness of Lothian
Earl of Litchfield
Countess of Londonderry
Lady Viscountess Lansborough
Lord Londonderry
Lady Lovell
Right Hon. Lady Harriot Lumley
Lord Bishop of Limerick
Honourable Mrs. Lumley
Honourable Mrs. Lake
Mr. Baron Linday
Sir Henry Liddall, Bart.
Sir Robert Long, Bart.
Honourable Colonel Lenoc

Rev. Mr. George Lloyd, 2 Books
Mrs. Legh
Rev. Mr. George Lesley, 2 Books
Mr. Long
Mrs. Lenthal of Burford
Peter Ludlow Esq.
George Lewis Esq.
Erasmus Lewis Esq.
- - - - Lane, M. D.
William Lingan Esq.
- - - - Lounds Esq.
- - - - Lounds Esq.
William Levens, Esq.
Mrs. Layton
Mrs. Martha Litley
Mrs. Lawes of Jamaica
Mrs. Lambert

Duchess of Kent
Earl of Kildare
Lord Bishop of Killalla
Lord Bishop of Killmore
Lord Bishop of Killdair
Lord Kingstane
Lord Kingstane
Lady Dowager Killmorey
Lady Killmorey

Rev. Dr. King, Senior Fellow of T. C. D.
Mrs. Frances Arabella Kelly

K

- - - - Law.
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- - - - - Lawton, A. M.
Mr. Leake of Bath
Richard Leaunt Esq.
Mrs. Mary Lyfght
Mrs. Catherine Lyfght
Mrs. Lutwyck
Mr. Christophor Lovet
Mr. Thomas Lovet
Mrs. Sarah Lambret
Mr. Ralph Leland

Reverend Dr. Martin
Reverend Dr. Maddox
Honourable Colonel Mordaunt
Mifs Mordaunt
Pooley Molynex Esq.
Honourable Colonel Morgan
Mrs. Morehead
Mrs. Mitton
Mrs. Middleton, of North Wales
Richard Middlemore Esq.
Mrs. Maxwell
Mrs. Jemima Montague
Mrs. Munday
Mr. Macmoran
George Mathews Esq. of Thomas Town
James Monroe, M. D.
James Moor Esq.
- - - - - Marriott Esq.
William Moreton Esq.
Mr. Thomas Mead
William Munfie Esq.
Robert Marshall Esq.
Reverend Mr. Charles Masly
Mr. Richard Malone
Mrs. Jane Monck
Mr. John Markham

Duchess of Norfolk
Duchess of Newcastle, 7 Books
Duchess of Northumberland
Countess of Nottingham
Right Hon. Lady Barbary North
Robt. Nugent Esq.; 8 Books
- - - - - North Esq.
Mifs
### A List of the Subscribers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title and Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mist North</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Michael Newton, Bart.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Nevill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Globury Noel, Bart.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Elizabeth Newans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Nath</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Sarah Nepuen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Nath</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Walter Noél</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Nanny</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Elizabeth Nevison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Nugent, Esq.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Mixou, Esq.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. James Nugent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. William Newnham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title and Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke of Portland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duchesses of Portland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Pembroke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countess of Pembroke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countess of Plymouth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earl of Pomfret</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rt. Hon. Lady Frances Pierpoint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rt. Hon. Lady Caroline Pierpoint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Percival</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Polwarth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Parker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honourable Philip Percival, Esq.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honourable Mrs. Martha Percival</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Pyne, 5 Books</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----- Page, Esq.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honourable Mrs. Page, 2 Books</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Pendarvis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Pope, Esq.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honourable Colonel Poulney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Pocé, of Twickenham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Poulney, Esq., 5 Books</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Poulney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Philip Parker, Bart.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambroise Phillips, Esq.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Periode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Perrot, Esq.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverend Mr. Marmaduke Phillips</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Andrew Perrot, Jun.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----- Pelham, Esq.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----- Peters, M.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----- Pentan, Esq.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Pierce, Esq.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Pitt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Price</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Plaxton, Esq.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain John Petit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Andrew Pitt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roger
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Roger Palmer, Esq.
Mrs. Palmer
John Putland, Esq.
Mrs. Bridget Putland
Mr. Thomas Putland
Mr. John Power
- - - - - Peachy, Esq.
William Palliser, Esq.
Mrs. Palliser
Miss Pearson
Mr. Arthur Pond

Q

Duke of Queensberry
Duchess of Queensberry

R

Duchess of Richmond
Duke of Rutland
Duchess of Rutland, 3 Books
Duchess Dowager of Rutland
Diana, Duchess Dowager of Rutland
Lord Ranleigh
Lady Rook
Lady Roydon
Lord Chief Baron Reynolds
Mrs. Reynolds
Mrs. Judith Reynolds
Lady Rich
Honourable Mrs. Robinson
Reverend Dr. Rye, Archdeacon of Oxford
- - - - - Robins, Esq.
Mr. David Rochford
Reverend Mr. Stephen Roe

Jerom Ruffell, Esq.
Mrs. Elizabeth Row
Mr. Jeremiah Ridge
Mrs. Elizabeth Roach
William Richardson, Esq.
Simon Robinson, Esq., 2 Books
George Robinson, Esq.
Rev. Mr. Archdeacon Rickard
Mr. Noah Regent
Mr. Rudge
Mr. John Rotten
Mr. Isaac Rider
Mr. Charles Rivington
Mrs. Mary Reader
Mr. William Ruft
Mr. Richard Ruffell
Mr. John Rathburn
Mr. Kourk of Athy
Mrs. Elizabeth Rocoe
Mr. S. Richardson
John Rochford, Esq.
Mrs. Alice Rochford

S

Duke of Somerset
Duchess of Somerset
Duke of St. Albans, 2 Books
Duchess of St Albans, 2 Books
Reverend Dr. Jonathan Swift,
D. S. P. D. 10 Books
Earl of Scarborough
Earl of Shaftesbury
Countess of Stanfords
Countess of Straffords
Earl of Sunderland
Earl of Selkirk, 3 Books
Countess of Sunderland
Honourable John Spencer, Esq.
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Right Hon. Lady Diana Spencer
Baron Sulcethon
Lord Stawell
Hon. John Skeffington, Esq.
Skeffington Smith, Esq.
Sir John Stanley, Bart.
Sir Thomas Smith, Bart.
Sir John St Aubin Bart.
Honourable Edward Southwell
Honourable Mrs. Southwell
Sir William Strickland Bart.
Sir Robert Smith Bart.
Honourable Hays St. Leger Esq.
Henry Singleton Esq. Prime Serjeant 3 Books
William Sturt Esq.
Lady Stanhope
Lady Skipwith
Mrs. Sandys
Mrs. Stanley
Sir John Shadwell
Mr. Shadwell
Mr. Henry Simpson
Reverend Mr. Sampson
- - - - - Sandys Esq.
Reverend Mr. Sterling
William Sherd Esq.
Mrs. Stroud
Richard Shuttleworth Esq.
Mrs. Anne Shuttleworth
- - - - - Stroud Esq.
Rev. Mr. Robert Shaw S.F.T.C.D.
- - - - - Skrine Esq. of Warly
Mrs. Skrine
Mrs. Skerret
Thomas Stannton Esq. of the Inner-Temple.
Mrs. Henrietta Shaw
Arthur Shorter Esq.
Mrs. Henrietta Spence
Mrs. Slicer
Mr. Arthur Smith
Mr. John Sican A. B.
Mrs. Delia Shelley
Mr. Isaac Sherd
Mr. Henry Spencer
Mrs. Anne Skinner.
Reverend Dr. Scot
Alderman Saltier
Randolph Stracey Esq.
William Sandford Esq.
Reverend Dr. Sheriden
Mrs. Sarah Smith
Reverend Mr. Stewart
Robert Savage Esq.
Reverend Mr. Steward
Richard Stone Esq. L.L.D.
Mr. James Sandford
Mrs. Elizabeth Sican
Boyle Spencer Esq.
Mr. Richard Steel Attorney
Mrs. Smith
Reverend Mr. James Stopford
James Stopford Esq.
Edwin Sandys Esq.
Mr. Edward Syngue
Mrs. Sheldon
Mrs. Stewart
Mr. Thomas Southern
Reverend Mr. Peter Selby.

Earl of Thomond 5 Books
Countess of Thomond 5 Books
Lady Viscountess Tracy
Lady Dowager Torrington 3 Books
Lady Tyrerlay
A List of the Subscribers.

Lord Tullamore
Mrs. Tench of Chelsea
Honourable John Temple Esq.
Reverend Dr. Thomson
Hon. Thomas Townshend Esq.
Honourable Colonel Townshend
Mrs. Tennifon 10 Books
Thomas Tickell Esq.
Mrs. Tickell
Miss Tennifon 2 Books
Miss Talbot
Pate Thoroughgood Esq.
William Trumbal Esq.
George Tervill Esq.
Mrs. Tomkys
Mrs. Talboth
Richard Tonson Esq.
Joseph Taylor Esq.
Reverend Dean Taylor
Mrs. Talbot
Rev. Mr. John Travers A. M.
Reverend Mr. Thomion of Athy
Dr. Trotter
Mr. William Tims

Mrs. Vernon
Arthur Vanfittat Esq.
John Vanlewen M. D.
Mrs. Elizabeth Unwin
Mr. William Vivian
Mr. Serjeant Urien
Mr. George Usher, Merchants

W

Countess of Winchelsea
Lady Viscount Weymouth
Honourable Lady Worstley
Right Hon. Sir Robert Walpole,
  5 Books
Sir William Windham Bart.
Sir John Werden Bart.
Charles Windham Esq.
Mr. Baron Wainwright
Horatio Walpole Esq.
Edward Walpole Esq.
Thomas Western Esq.
- - - - Western Esq.
William Ward L. D. Judge of
  the Prerogative Court of York.
Mr. Western
- - - - Winnington Esq.
Richard Welfley Esq.
Mrs. Welfley
Miss Welfley
Honourable Governor Worstley
Watkin Williams Wynn Esq.
William Ward Esq.
William Woodrofe Esq.
Grantham Wheeler Esq.
Plucknet Woodrofe Esq.
Thomas Wynn Esq.
Henry Wallis Esq.
Nicholas Wogan Esq.

Mr.
### A List of the Subscribers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr. William Wogan</th>
<th>Mr. William Watts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard Wenman Esq.</td>
<td>Reverend Mr. Samuel Webber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Warburton</td>
<td>Mr. Hugh White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Hanbury Williams; Esq.</td>
<td>Mrs. Worrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honourable Colonel Warburton</td>
<td>Mr. Samuel Warren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Wilton</td>
<td>Mr. Thomas Wilford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Anne Waddel</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Susanna Watts</td>
<td>Sir William Yonge, Knight of the Bath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Woleston</td>
<td>Reverend Dr. Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. James Worfdale</td>
<td>Mrs. Yate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Stephen Winthorepe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Thomas Woford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain Thomas Whitney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. John Wilton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Richard Wilton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the above Names were sent to the Pref, the following have come to Hand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mrs. Rebecca Beven</th>
<th>Mrs. Elizabeth Clark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Deborah Buckle</td>
<td>Mrs. Anne Elliot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Anne Barclay</td>
<td>Mr. Millington Hayford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Elizabeth Barclay</td>
<td>- - - - Littleton, Esq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Patience Barclay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2.2: Subscription List to Barber’s *Poems on Several Occasions* (1734) arranged by social group

**Peers**

**Dukes**

1. Duke of Argyll
2. Duke of Bedford
3. Duke of Bolton
4. Duke of Buckinghamshire
5. Duke of Chandos
6. Duke of Cleveland
7. Duke of Dorset
8. Duke of Grafton
9. Duke of Manchester
10. Duke of Portland
11. Duke of Queensbury
12. Duke of Rutland
13. Duke of Somerset
14. Duke of St. Albans

**Earls**

1. Earl of Arran
2. Earl of Bristol
3. Earl of Breadalbane
4. Earl of Cholmondeley
5. ---- Earl of Cholmondeley
6. Earl Cowper
7. Earl of Clanrickard
8. Earl of Essex
9. Earl of Egmont  
10. Earl of Grannard  
11. Earl of Hertford  
12. Earl of Halifax  
13. Earl of Inchiquin  
14. Earl of Kildare  
15. Earl of Lichfield  
16. Earl of Marchmont  
17. Earl of Montragh  
18. Earl of Oxford  
19. Charles Earl of Orrery  
20. John Earl of Orrery  
21. Earl of Pembroke  
22. Earl of Pomfret  
23. Earl of Scarborough  
24. Earl of Shaftesbury  
25. Earl of Sunderland  
26. Earl of Selkirk  
27. Earl of Thomond

**Viscounts**

1. Lord Viscount Bulkeley  
2. Lord Boyle (2nd Viscount Blesington)  
3. Lord Boyne (2nd Viscount Boyne)  
4. Lord Viscount Cobham  
5. Lord Gage (1st Viscount Gage)  
6. Lord Viscount Mountjoy  
7. Lord Percival
8. Lord Ranelagh (4th Viscount of Ranelagh)
9. Lord Viscount Weymouth

**Barons**

1. Lord Bathurst (Baron Bathurst 1712-1772)
2. Lord Bateman
3. Baron Bothmar
4. Lord Carteret
5. Lord Carpenter (2nd Baron Carpenter)
6. Lord Dunkerron
7. Lord Foley (2nd Baron Foley)
8. Lord Gower
9. Lord Kingsale
10. Lord Kingsland
11. Lord Lansdown
12. Lord Malton
13. Lord Massam
14. Lord Percival
15. Baron Sulenthon
16. Lord Stawell
17. Lord Tullamore
18. Lord Vane
Duchess
1. Duchess of Argyle
2. Duchess of Buckinghamshire
3. Duchess of Chandos
4. Duchess of Cleveland
5. Duchess of Devonshire
6. Duchess of Kent
7. Duchess of Manchester
8. Duchess of Norfolk
9. Duchess of Newcastle
10. Duchess of Northumberland
11. Duchess of Ormond
12. Duchess of Portland
13. Duchess of Queensbury
14. Duchess of Richmond
15. Duchess of Rutland
16. Duchess of Somerset
17. Duchess of St. Albans

Dowager Duchess
1. Dowager Duchess of Ancaster
2. Dowager Duchess of Cleveland
3. Dowager Duchess of Marlborough
4. Dowager Duchess of Rutland
5. Diana, Dowager Duchess of Rutland

Countess
1. Countess of Arran
2. Countess of Abercorn
3. Countess of Ashburnham
4. Countess of Barrimore
5. Countess of Carlingford
6. Countess of Clanrickard
7. Countess Cowper
8. Countess of Deloraine
9. Countess of Donegall
10. Countess of Egmont
11. Countess of Ferrers
12. Countess of Gainsborough
13. Countess of Granville
14. Countess of Grannard
15. Countess of Hertford
16. Countess of Harrold
17. Countess of Londonderry
18. Countess of Montragh (Montrath)
19. Countess of Nottingham
20. Countess of Oxford (Lady Henrietta Cavendish Holles, Countess of Oxford from 1724)
21. Countess of Orrery
22. Countess of Pembroke
23. Countess of Plymouth
24. Countess of Stamford
25. Countess of Strafford
26. Countess of Sunderland
27. Countess of Thomond
28. Countess of Winchelsea
Dowager Countess
1. Dowager Countess of Burlington
2. Dowager Countess of Cleveland
3. Dowager Countess of Donegall
4. Dowager Countess of Inchiquin

Marchioness
1. Marchioness of Blandford
2. Marchioness of Caermarthen
3. Marchioness of Lothian

Viscountess
1. Viscountess Bulkeley
2. Viscountess Downrayle (Doneraile)
3. Viscountess Ekerrin (Ikerrin)
4. Viscountess Fitzwilliams
5. Viscountess Lansborough
6. Viscountess Tracy

Dowager Viscountess
1. Dowager Viscountess Bulkeley

The ‘Quality’ (including wives of peers, relations of peers, knighthoods and other honorific titles)
1. Lady Achison
2. Honourable Mrs. Bulkeley
3. Honourable Mrs. Eleonora Bulkeley
4. Lady Bathurst
5. Honourable Mrs. Frances Bathurst
6. Honourable Mrs. Catherine Bathurst
8. Lady Elizabeth Brownlow
9. Lady Amelia Butler
10. Lady Elizabeth Boyle
11. Honourable Hamilton Boyle
12. Honourable Mrs. Mary Butler
13. Honourable Mrs. Badham
14. Lady Barker
15. Sir John Bruce
16. Lady Butler
17. Lady Blunt
18. Honourable Mrs. Bridges
19. Lady Carteret
20. Lady Penelope Cholmondeley
21. Lady Sarah Cowper
22. Lady Frances Clifton
23. Lady Coningsby
24. Lady Frances Coningsby
25. Charlotte Lady Conway
26. Lady Coleraine
27. Lady Mary Colley
28. Lady Carpenter
29. Lady Mary Carmichael
31. Sir William Chapman
32. Lady Coddrington
33. Honourable John Chichester, Esq.
34. Honourable ----- Cooke, Esq.
35. Lady Curson
36. Lady de Collidon
37. Lady Cox
38. Honourable Mrs. Conolly
39. Lady Cottrell
41. Lady Anne Dowglas
42. Lady De Laware
43. Honourable Mrs. Diana Dawson
44. Honourable Mrs. Anne Donnellan
45. Honourable Mrs. Devereux
46. Honourable ----- Digby, Esq.
47. Rt. Honourable George-Bubb Doddington, Esq.
48. Sir Matthew Decker
49. Honourable Mrs. Eye, of Eyre Court
50. Sir Joseph Eyles
51. Lady Elizabeth Finch
52. Lady Folliot
53. Honourable ----- Finch, Esq.
54. Honourable William Finch, Esq.
55. Sir Andrew Fountaine
56. Sir John Frederick
57. Lady Guilford
58. Lady Glenorcy
59. Lady Elizabeth Germain
60. Lady Mary Godolphin
61. Honourable William-Leveson Gower
62. Lady Archibald Hamilton
63. Lady Anne Harvey
64. Honourable Thomas Harvey, Esq.
65. Lady Catherine Hyde
66. Lady Charlotte Hyde
67. Lady Elizabeth Hastings
68. Lady Frances Hastings
69. Lady Anne Hastings
70. Lady Elizabeth Herbert
71. Lady Rebecca Herbert
72. Lady Anne Harvey (down twice?)
73. Honourable Thomas Harvey, Esq. (down twice?)
74. Lady Hardwick
75. Lady Harcourt
76. Lady Hanmer
77. Honourable Mrs. Sophia Hamilton
78. Honourable Mrs. Hamilton
79. Lady Harper
80. Lady Catherine Jones
81. Lady Jekyll
82. Dowager Lady Killmorey
83. Lady Killmorey
84. Honourable Isabella Lady King
85. Lady Lovell
86. Lady Harriot Lumley
87. Honourable Mrs. Lumley
88. Honourable Mrs. Lake
89. Lady Mountcashel
90. Lady Mountjoy
91. Lady Massam
92. Honourable Robert Moor, Esq.
93. Honourable Justin McCarthy, Esq.
94. Honourable Capel Moor, Esq.
95. Lady Barbara North
96. Honourable Mrs. Obrien
97. Elizabeth Lady Osbourn
98. Lady Osbourn
99. Lady Frances Pierpoint
100. Lady Catherine Pierpoint
101. Lady Polwarth
102. Lady Parker
103. Honourable Philip Percival, Esq.
104. Honourable Mrs. Martha Percival
105. Honourable Mrs. Page
106. Lady Rook
107. Lady Roydon
108. Lady Rich
109. Honourable Mrs. Robinson
110. Honourable John Spencer, Esq.
111. Lady Diana Spencer
112. Honourable John Skeffington, Esq.
113. Honourable Edward Southwell
114. Honourable Mrs. Southwell
115. Honourable Hays St. Leger, Esq.
116. Lady Stanhope
117. Lady Skipwith
118. Sir John Shadwell
119. Lady Dowager Torrington
120. Lady Tyrawley
121. Honourable John Temple, Esq.
122. Honourable Thomas Townshend, Esq.
123. Lady Vasey
124. Honourable Mrs. Verney
125. Elizabeth Lady Vesey
126. Honourable Lady Worseley
127. Sir William Yonge, Knight of the Bath

Baronets

1. Sir Thomas Aston, Bart.
2. Sir Gerrard Aymler, Bart.
5. Sir. Germyn Davers, Bart.
7. Sir John Eyles, Bart.
8. Sir Thomas Frankland, Bart.
10. Sir Samuel Garrard, Bart.
11. Sir John Jocelyn, Bart. (of Hide-Hall in Hertfordshire)
12. Sir. Thomas Hanmer, Bart.
13. Sir Henry King, Bart.
16. Sir Robert Maud, Bart.
17. Sir Richard Mead, Bart.
18. Sir Michael Newton, Bart.
19. Sir Clobury Noel, Bart.
20. Sir Philip Parker, Bart.
22. Sir Thomas Smith, Bart.
23. Sir John St. Aubin, Bart.
26. Sir John Vesey, Bart.
27. Sir William Windham, Bart.
28. Sir John Werden, Bart.

Esquires

1. Robert Atbyn, Esq.
2. Francis Annesley, Esq.
3. Pierce Acourt, Esq.
4. Robert Atkins, Esq.
5. Patrick Aylmer, Esq.
10. Thomas Booth, Esq.
11. Lancelot Burton, Esq.
12. Thomas Bacon, Esq.
13. Thomas Beake, Esq.
14. Martin Bladen, Esq.
15. James Beltsher, Esq.
16. Francis Barnard, Esq.
17. George Bagnell, Esq.
18. ----- Basil, Esq.
20. John Bridges, Esq.
23. Robert Barber, Esq.
27. Clement Barry, Esq.
28. Francis Burton, Esq.
30. Thomas Cuff, Esq.
31. Thomas Carbonnel, Esq.
33. Darby Clarke, Esq.
34. Charles Coote, Esq.
35. Charles, Caesar, Esq.
36. William Cartwright, Esq.
37. St. John Charleton, Esq.
38. ----- Churchill, Esq.
39. ----- Churchill, Esq.
40. Charles Compton, Esq.
41. Thomas Carter, Esq.
42. James Cox, Esq.
43. ----- Cotton, Esq.
44. ----- Corbet, Esq.
45. ----- Clayton, Esq.
46. ----- Crose, Esq.
47. John Conduit, Esq.
48. Francis Clark, Esq.
49. Francis Chute, Esq.
50. Colthope Clayton, Esq.
51. Alexius Clayton, Esq.
52. William Cleeland, Esq.
53. Cornelius Callaghan, Esq.
54. Anthony Duncombe, Esq.
55. Francis Dayrell, Esq.
56. James Dowglas, Esq.
57. Whitfield Doyne, Esq.
58. Peter Daly, Esq.
59. Peter Delme, Esq.
60. John Duncombe, Esq.
61. Gibson Dalzell, Esq.
62. ----- Dalton, Esq.
63. Robert Elwis, Esq.
64. Charles Ecklin, Esq.
65. Richard Evelyn, Esq.
66. ----- Edgecombe, Esq.
67. Simon Eris, Esq.
68. John Frederick, Esq.
69. Warden Flood, Esq.
70. Robert French, Esq.
71. Thomas Frederick, Esq.
72. James Fox, Esq.
73. Richard Fitzgerald, Esq.
74. Matthew Fitzgerald, Esq.
75. Matthew Ford, Esq. Of Seaford
76. James Forth, Esq.
77. John Foulke, Esq.
78. Nathaniel Ford, Esq.
79. William Foundes, Esq.
80. Barnard Granville, Esq.
81. Oliver Saint-George, Esq.
82. Richard Geering, Esq.
83. Burrington Goldsworthy, Esq.
84. Edward Griffith, Esq.
85. Crisp Gascoyne, Esq.
88. Francis Guybon, Esq.
89. Roger Harrison, Esq.
90. George Harr, Esq.
91. ----- Campbel Hamilton, Esq.
92. John Hanbury, Esq.
93. William Hanbury, Esq.
94. ----- Harper, Esq.
95. Walter Hungerford, Esq.
96. Arthur Hill, Esq.
97. Rowly Hill, Esq.
98. Nathaniel Hook, Esq.
99. Talbot Ivory, Esq.
100. James James, Esq.
102. William Jennings, Esq.
103. Robert Janson, Esq.
104. Thomas Jackson, Esq.
105. ----- Jackson, Esq.
106. George Keat, Esq.
109. ----- Knight, Esq.
110. Peter Ludlow, Esq.
111. George Lewis, Esq.
112. Erasmus Lewis, Esq.
113. William Lingen, Esq.
114. ----- Lounds, Esq.
115. ----- Lounds, Esq. (down twice?)
117. Richard Lehunt, Esq.
118. Thomas Maul, Esq.
119. ----- Mennel, Esq.
120. Edmund Malone, Esq.
121. Pooley Molyneux, Esq.
122. Richard Middlemore, Esq.
123. George Matthews Esq. Of Thomas Town
124. James Moor, Esq.
125. ----- Mariot, Esq.
126. William Moreton, Esq.
127. William Munsel, Esq.
130. ----- North, Esq.
131. James Nugent, Esq.
132. David Mixon, Esq.
133. George Ogle, Esq.
134. Charles O Hara, Esq.
135. William Ostrolong, Esq.
136. Crew Ostley, Esq.
137. ----- Page, Esq.
139. William Poulney, Esq.
140. Ambrose Philips Esq.
141. George Perrot, Esq.
142. ----- Pelham ,Esq.
143. ----- Pentan, Esq.
144. Edward Pierce, Esq.
145. William Plaxton, Esq.
146. Roger Palmer, Esq.
147. John Putland, Esq.
148. ----- Peachy, Esq.
149. William Palliser, Esq.
150. ----- Robins, Esq.
152. William Richardson, Esq.
153. Simon Robinson, Esq.
154. George Robinson, Esq.
155. John Rochford, Esq.
156. Skeffington Smith, Esq.
158. ----- Sandys, Esq.
159. William Sherd, Esq.
161. ----- Stroud, Esq.
162. ----- Skrine, Esq. of Warly
163. Arthur Shorter, Esq.
164. Randolph Stracey, Esq.
165. Henry Sandford Jun., Esq.
166. William Sandford, Esq.
168. Boyle Spencer, Esq.
169. James Stopford, Esq.
170. Edwin Sandys, Esq.
171. Thomas Tickell, Esq.
172. Pate Thoroughgood, Esq.
173. William Trumbal, Esq.
174. George Tervill, Esq.
175. Richard Tonson, Esq.
177. Matthew Vernon, Esq.
178. George Vaughan, Esq.
179. William Ussher, Esq.
180. Henry Ussher, Esq.
181. John Ussher, Esq.
182. George Venable Vernon, Esq.
183. Arthur Vansitat, Esq.
184. Charles Windham, Esq.
185. Horatio Walpole, Esq.
186. Edward Walpole, Esq.
187. Thomas Western, Esq.
188. ----- Western, Esq.
189. ----- Winnington, Esq.
190. Richard Westley, Esq.
191. Watkin William Wynn, Esq.
193. William Woodrose, Esq.
195. Plucknet Woodrose, Esq.
196. Thomas Wynn, Esq.
197. Henry Wallis, Esq.
198. Nicholas Wogan, Esq.
199. Richard Wenman, Esq.
200. Charles Hanbury Williams, Esq.
Clergy

Archbishop

1. Archbishop of Dublin

Bishop

1. Bishop of Bristol
2. Bishop of Cloyn (Cloyne)
3. Bishop of Derry
4. Bishop of Killala
5. Bishop of Killmore
6. Bishop of Killdair (Kildare)
7. Bishop of Limerick

Archdeacon

1. Dr. Rye, Archdeacon of Oxford
2. Mr. Archdeacon Rickard

Dean

1. Reverend Dr. Cotterel, Dean of Raphoe
2. Reverend Dr. Jonathan Swift, D.S.P.D.
3. Reverend Dean Taylor

Reverend

1. Dr. Bradford
2. Mr. Botteler
3. Mr Thomas Bullen, A.M.
4. Mr. George Babe, L.L.B.
5. Dr. Carmichael
6. Dr. Alured Clarke
7. Mr. Carthy
8. Mr. Cook, A.M.
9. Dr. Delany
10. Mr. Donnellan, Fellow of T.C.D.
11. Mr. Philip Downs
12. Mr. Sloan Elsmore
13. Dr. Freind
14. Mr. Ford, Fellow of T.C.D.
15. Mr. John Gratton
16. Dr. Hales
17. Dr. Harbin
18. Dr. Jackson, of St. Michans
19. Doctor Kearny
20. Dr. King, Senior Fellow of T.C.D.
21. Mr. George Lloyd
22. Mr. George Lesley
23. Mr. Madden
24. Mr. McMullen
25. Dr. Martin
26. Dr. Maddox
27. Mr. Charles Massy
28. Mr. Obbins, Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin
29. Mr. Marmaduke Phillips
30. Mr. Stephen Roe
31. Mr. Sampson
32. Mr. Sterling
33. Mr. Robert Shaw, S.F.T.C.D.
34. Dr. Scot
35. Dr. Sheridan
36. Mr. Stewart
37. Mr. Steward
38. Mr. James Stopford
39. Mr. Peter Selby
40. Dr. Thompson
41. Mr. John Travers, A.M.
42. Mr. Thompson, of Athy
43. Mr. Samuel Webber
44. Dr. Young

Office Holders

‘Prime Minister’ of England

1. Sir Robert Walpole

Alderman

1. John Barber, Alderman of London
2. Sir Robert Bayliss, Alderman of London
3. Alderman Champion
4. Sir Francis Child, Alderman of London
5. Alderman Kendal
6. Alderman Gilbert King
7. Alderman Salter

Master of the Rolls

1. Sir Joseph Jekyll, Master of the Rolls

Judge

1. William Ward, Judge of the Prerogative Court of York
Baron of the Exchequer

1. Lord Chief Baron Marley
2. Lord Chief Baron Reynolds
3. Mr. Baron Wainwright
4. Mr. Baron Lindsay

Serjeant-at-law (King’s Serjeant)

1. Henry Singleton

Attorney General of Ireland

1. Robert Jocelyn

Speaker to the House of Commons

1. Arthur Onslow

Governors

1. Governor Hart
2. Governor Morrice
3. Governor Worseley

Military: Office holders

Brigadier

1. Hon. Brigadier General Jones

Major General

1. Major General Dormer
Colonel

1. Col. John Archer
2. Col. Bladen
3. Col. Dallaway
4. Col. Disney
5. Col. Fane
6. Col. Lenoe
7. Col. Mordaunt
8. Col. Morgan
9. Col. Poulney
10. Colonel Townshend
11. Col. Warburton

Captain

1. Capt. Bannastre
2. Capt. John Dawson
3. Capt. Folliot
4. Capt. John Petit
5. Capt. Thomas Whitney

Soldiers

Sergeant

1. Mr. Sergeant Garrard
2. Mr. Sergeant Urlin


**Professions**

**Medical Doctors**

1. James Arbuthnott, M.D.
2. ----- Burton, M.D.
3. ----- Coult, M.D.
4. ----- Dodd, M.D.
5. James Gratton, M.D.
6. Richard Helsham, M.D.
7. ----- Lane, M.D.
8. Richard Mead, M.D.
9. James Monroe, M.D.
10. ----- Peters, M.D.
11. John Vanlewen, M.D.

**Law**

1. Richard Steel, Attorney
2. Thomas Stanntton, Esq. Of the Inner Temple (barrister)

**Degree holders**

1. Dr. Bland
2. Dr. Cottrel
3. Mr. William Dunkin, A.M.
4. Mr. Delacourt, A.B.
5. ----- Lawson, A.M.
6. Richard Stone, L.L.D.
7. Mr. John Sican, A.B.
8. Dr. Trotter
Miscellaneous

Mr.

1. Mr. Thomas Aldern
2. Mr. James Agutter, of St. Albans
3. Mr. Bothmore
4. Mr. William Bridgen
5. Mr. Thomas Bondler
6. Mr. Francis Boudler
7. Mr. Thomas Bayly
8. Mr. George Boyd
9. Mr. Bradstock
10. Mr. John Bartley
11. Mr. Robert Cowel
12. Mr. Thomas Carte
13. Mr. John Chantry
14. Mr. Daniel Collier
15. Mr. Alexander Conyngham
16. Mr. Michael Cormic
17. Mr. Cromie
18. Mr. John Cook
19. Mr. Daniel Conyngham, Merchant
20. Mr. Edward Curtis
21. Mr. Duffkin
22. Mr. William Duncombe
23. Mr. Durell
24. Mr. William Douglas
25. Mr. William Dob
26. Mr. George Faulkner
27. Mr. James Flack
28. Mr. Richard Fitzgerald
29. Mr. Thomas Finlay
30. Mr. John French
31. Mr. James Flemming
32. Mr. John Ferrer
33. Mr. John Gay
34. Mr. Bamber Gascoyne
35. Mr. George Grierson
36. Mr. Garnier Jun.
37. Mr. John Gascoine
38. Mr. William Gardiner
39. Mr. Theophilus Glover
40. Mr. William Gavin
41. Mr. Girney
42. Mr. Gill, of Chelsea
43. Mr. Edward Herbert
44. Mr. John Hayes
45. Mr. ----- Hamilton, of Callidon
46. Mr. Hanmer
47. Mr. Thomas Hall, Merchant
48. Mr. John Howison
49. Mr. Joye
50. Mr. Philip Jennings
51. Mr. Francis Jones
52. Mr. John Jackson
53. Mr. Jacob Jackson, of T.C.D.
54. Mr. Francis Jones (down twice?)
55. Mr. Henry Johnson
56. Mr. John Knox
57. Mr. Charles Knapton
58. Mr. Long
59. Mr. Leake, of Bath
60. Mr. Christopher Lovet
61. Mr. Thomas Lovet
62. Mr. Ralph Leland
63. Mr. Macmoran
64. Mr. Thomas Mead
65. Mr. Richard Malone
66. Mr. John Markham
67. Mr. Nash
68. Mr. Walter Noel
69. Mr. James Nugent
70. Mr. William Newnham
71. Mr. Andrew Perrot Jun.
72. Mr. Andrew Pitt
73. Mr. Thomas ------
74. Mr. Thomas Putland
75. Mr. John Power
76. Mr. Arthur Pond
77. Mr. David Rochford
78. Mr. Jeremiah Ridge
79. Mr. Noah Regnent
80. Mr. Rudge
81. Mr. John Rotten
82. Mr. Isaac Rider
83. Mr. Charles Rivington
84. Mr. William Rush
85. Mr. Richard Russell
86. Mr. John Rathburn
87. Mr. Rourk of Athy
88. Mr. S. Richardson
89. Mr. Shadwell
90. Mr. Henry Simpson
91. Mr. Arthur Smith
92. Mr. Isaac Sherd
93. Mr. Henry Spencer
94. Mr. James Sandford
95. Mr. Edward Synge
96. Mr. Thomas Southern
97. Mr. William Tims
98. Mr. William Vivian
99. Mr. George Ussher, Merchant
100. Mr. Western
101. Mr. William Wogan
102. Mr. Wilson
103. Mr. James Worsdale
104. Mr. Stephen Winthrope
105. Mr. Thomas Withford
106. Mr. John Wilson
107. Mr. Richard Wilson
108. Mr. William Watts
109. Mr. Hugh White
110. Mr. Samuel Warren
111. Mr. Thomas Wilford
112. Mr. Millington Hayford

Mrs.

1. Mrs. Achison
2. Mrs. Archer
3. Mrs. Apreece
4. Mrs. Aynscomb
5. Mrs. Allen
6. Mrs. Ashurst
7. Mrs. Askins
8. Mrs. Augshire
9. Mrs. Margaret Adams
10. Mrs. Britton
11. Mrs. Bottelar
12. Mrs. Bevans, of Lombard-street
13. Mrs. Bumstead
14. Mrs. Barber
15. Mrs. Anne Barry
16. Mrs. Belasyse
17. Mrs. Deborah Boudler
18. Mrs. Letitia Bush
19. Mrs. Christian Bennet
20. Mrs. Bolton
21. Mrs. Bambridge
22. Mrs. Burton
23. Miss Burton
24. Mrs. Bevans
25. Mrs. Clayton
26. Mrs. Hester Coghill
27. Mrs. Caesar
28. Mrs. Armine Cartwright
29. Mrs. Cornwallis
30. Mrs. Campbel
31. Mrs. Conduit
32. Mrs. Crawford
33. Mrs. Diana Cook
34. Mrs. Elizabeth Carleton
35. Mrs. Elizabeth Crisp
36. Mrs. Catherine Chichester
37. Mrs. Ursula Crumpton
38. Mrs. Elizabeth Crumpton
39. Mrs. De Cuna
40. Mrs. Cottrel
41. Mrs. Campion
42. Mrs. Juliana Crotty
43. Mrs. Cockburn
44. Mrs. Jane Cottrel
45. Mrs. Chandler, of Bath
46. Mrs. Clavering
47. Mrs. Cannon
48. Mrs. Crowley
49. Mrs. Hannah Clements
50. Mrs. Elizabeth Clements
51. Mrs. Cashel
52. Mrs. Alice Clarke
53. Mrs. Charlotte Davenant
54. Mrs. Sophia Duncombe
55. Mrs. Sarah Duffkin
56. Mrs. Drelincourt
57. Mrs. Anne Drelincourt
58. Mrs. Downs
59. Mrs. Dives
60. Mrs. Anne Donnellan
61. Mrs. Jane Delme
62. Mrs. Anne Delme
63. Mrs. Anne Don
64. Mrs. Catherine Daly
65. Mrs. Dillon
66. Miss Dillon
67. Mrs. Drake
68. Mrs. Sarah Deacon
69. Mrs. Dashwood
70. Mrs. H. Dunch
71. Miss Dean
72. Miss Dolbin
73. Mrs. Dob
74. Mrs. Edwin
75. Mrs. Mary Edwards
76. Mrs. Eyre
77. Mrs. Elliot
78. Mrs. Earnly
79. Mrs. Fullerton
80. Mrs. Biddy Floyd
81. Mrs. Fellows
82. Mrs. Freeman
83. Mrs. Foster
84. Mrs. Sarah Foster
85. Mrs. ---- Floyd
86. Mrs. ---- Floyd
87. Mrs. Elizabeth Forth
88. Mrs. Faver
89. Mrs. Ford
90. Mrs. Dorothy Fellows
91. Mrs. Anne Granville
92. Mrs. Anne Gascoyne
93. Mrs. Margaret Gascoyne
94. Mrs. Garnier
95. Mrs. Mary Gordon
96. Mrs. Jane Gavin
97. Mrs. Hester George
98. Mrs. Helsham
99. Mrs. Harrison
Mrs. Campbel Hamilton
Mrs. Hill
Mrs. Hanger
Mrs. Anne Hayes
Mrs. Heathcote, of Windsor
Mrs. Jenkinson
Mrs. Jennings
Mrs. Jackson
Mrs. Jackson, of Southwark
Mrs. Jackson (down twice?)
Mrs. Sarah Jackson
Mrs. Jones
Mrs. Frances Arabella Kelly
Mrs. Kendal
Mrs. Lucy Johnson
Mrs. Legh
Mrs. Lenthal of Burford
Mrs. Layton
Mrs. Martha Litley
Mrs. Lawes of Jamaica
Miss Lambert
Mrs. Mary Lysaght
Mrs. Catherine Lysaght
Mrs. Lutwych
Mrs. Sarah Lambert
Mrs. Mead
Miss Mordaunt
127. Mrs. Morehead
128. Mrs. Mitton
129. Mrs. Middleton, of North Wales
130. Mrs. Maxwell
131. Mrs. Jemima Montague
132. Mrs. Munday
133. Mrs. Jane Monck
134. Miss North
135. Mrs. Nevill
136. Mrs. Elizabeth Newans
137. Mrs. Sarah Nepuen
138. Mrs. Nash
139. Mrs. Nanny
140. Mrs. Elizabeth Nevison
141. Mrs. Rebecaa Olgood
142. Miss Pyne
143. Mrs. Pendarvis
144. Mrs. Pope, of Twickenham
145. Mrs. Poultney
146. Mrs. Persode
147. Mrs. Pitt
148. Mrs. Price
149. Mrs. Palmer
150. Mrs. Bridget Putland
151. Mrs. Palliser
152. Miss Pearson
153. Mrs. Reynolds
154. Mrs. Judith Reynolds
155. Mrs. Elizabeth Row
156. Mrs. Elizabeth Roach
157. Mrs. Mary Reader
158. Mrs. Elizabeth Rocoe
159. Mrs. Alice Rochford
160. Mrs. Sandys
161. Mrs. Stanley
162. Mrs. Anne Shuttleworth
163. Mrs. Strout
164. Mrs. Skrine
165. Mrs. Skerret
166. Mrs. Henrietta Shaw
167. Mrs. Henrietta Spence
168. Mrs. Slicer
169. Mrs. Delia Shelley
170. Mrs. Anne Skinner
171. Mrs. Sarah Smith
172. Mrs. Elizabeth Sican
173. Mrs. Smith
174. Mrs. Sheldon
175. Mrs. Stewart
176. Mrs. Tench, of Chelsea
177. Mrs. Tennison
178. Mrs. Tickell
179. Miss Tennison
180. Miss Talbot
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Mrs. Tomkys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Mrs. Talboth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>Mrs. Talbot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>Miss Ussher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Mrs. Vernon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>Mrs. Elizabeth Unwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Mrs. Westley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Miss Westley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>Mrs. Warburton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Mrs. Anne Waddel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Mrs. Suzanna Watts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Mrs. Woleston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Mrs. Worrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>Mrs. Yate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>Mrs. Rebecca Beven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Mrs. Deborah Buckle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>Mrs. Anne Barclay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>Mrs. Elizabeth Barclay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Mrs. Patience Barclay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Mrs. Elizabeth Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Mrs. Anne Elliot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix 2.3:** Multiple subscriptions to Mary Barber’s *Poems on Several Occasions* (1734)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscriber</th>
<th>Number of Copies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Earl of Arran</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mrs. Achison</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Thomas Aldern</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Duchess of Buckinghamshire</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dowager Countess of Buckinghamshire</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. William Brownlow, Esq.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. John Barber, Alderman if London</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Rev. Dr. Bradford</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Francis Barnard</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Capt. Bannastre</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Lord Carteret</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Lady Francis Conningsby</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Charlotte Lady Conway</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Mrs. Clayton</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. St. John Charleton, Esq.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. John Hind Cotton</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Rev. Dr. Cottrel, Dean of Raphoe</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Duke of Dorset</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Rev. Dr. Delany</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Mrs. Drelincourt</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Mrs. Anne Drelincourt</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Mrs Mary Edwards</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Mrs. Eyre</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Mrs. Fellows</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Mrs. Dorothy Fellows</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Lady Elizabeth Germain</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Richard Geering, Esq.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Mr Garnier Jun.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Countess of Hertford</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Sir Thomas Hanmer, Bart.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Lady Hanmer</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Richard Helsham, MD</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. John Hanbury, Esq.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Catherine Jones</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriber</td>
<td>Number of Copies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. James James, Esq.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Rev. George Lloyd</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Rev. George Lesley</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Earl of Montragh</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Countess of Montragh</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Rev. Madden</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Richard Mead MD</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Mrs. Mead</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Rev. McMullen</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Duchess of Newcastle</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Robt. Nugent, Esq.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Duchess of Ormond</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Earl of Oxford</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Arthur Onslow, Speaker to House of Commons</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Miss Pyne</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Honourable Mrs. Page</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. William Poulney</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Duchess of Rutland</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Simon Robinson</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Duke of St. Albans</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Duchess of St. Albans</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Jonathan Swift, D.S.P.D</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Earl of Selkirk</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Henry Singleton, Prime Sergeant</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Earl of Thomond</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Countess of Thomond</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Dowager Lady Torrington</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Mrs. Tennison</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Miss Tennison</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Sir. Robert Walpole</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3.1

Appendix 3.2


2. Alderman John Barber’s official residence, Goldsmiths-Hall.

2. Mrs. Mary Caesar, ‘Collector’, Poland St.
3. Duke and Duchess of Queensberry, Burlington St.
5. Lady Elizabeth Germain, Lord Bathurst, St. James’s Sq.
6. Mary Barber, Conduit St., Soho.

1. Samuel Richardson, printing premises, between Salisbury Square, Dorset St. and Fleet St.
2. Charles Rivington, bookseller.
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