The *Lady's Poetical Magazine* and the Fashioning of Women's Literary Space

Octavia Cox

> Too long has Man, engrossing ev'ry art,
> Dar'd to reject the Female's rightful part
> (*Lady's Poetical Magazine* 1, 1782)

The Lady's Poetical Magazine; or, Beauties of British Poetry (hereafter *LPM*) ran to four volumes, 1781–2, and was edited by James Harrison. The Harrison publishing house was a family affair: James's uncle, Thomas, established the company in 1750; his father, also James, was involved in its running, as was his mother, Mary. The whole family's livelihood depended on the commercial success of their ventures, including *LPM*; making money was paramount. According to the family record, James Harrison II was born in 1765, and died in 1847 (Harrison 1950: 6), making him only fifteen or sixteen years old when *LPM* was first published. He may have been precociously young, but Harrison clearly had his finger on the pulse of the market. The judgement of the House of Lords, of 22 February 1774, in the case of *Donaldson v. Beckett*, effectively ended perpetual copyright for British authors, meaning that publishers such as Harrison could take advantage of all the material which thereby became available.[1] Selling collections of work previously published, whose popularity was already established, was now a relatively quick and easy way of turning a profit.[2] 'In the vast majority of cases', Suarez notes, 'poetical miscellanies were created as moneymaking endeavours'; 'Miscellanies were an attractive, because potentially very profitable, product for booksellers at every level of the market' as 'there was usually no need to pay fees to any of the authors whose work was being used' (2001: 218; 223–4). Harrison was one 'of the first persons who embarked, with much spirit and upon such an extensive scale, in such a mode of publication' (Rees 1896: 21). His first venture into this sphere was to edit the *Novelist's Magazine* (1780–8), which ran to twenty-three volumes and was, according to Rees, 'published weekly, at sixpence each' (1896: 21). Apparently an ebullient character, Harrison determinedly went on to publish *British Magazine and Review* (1782–3) and *Harrison's British Classicks* (1785–7). Evidently buoyed by the success of *LPM*, in the subsequent decade Harrison produced another magazine ostensibly aimed at women, *Lady's Pocket Magazine* (1795–6?). Harrison has been called a 'barometer' of popular late eighteenth-century 'taste' (Gamer 2008: 173–4; Taylor 1993: 638), and his endeavours evidently were financially rewarding (the Harrison publishing company continued into the late twentieth century). His editorial agenda in *LPM*, however, broke with normal convention; he included more poetry by women than was standard in contemporary miscellanies, as well as a high proportion of original poetry by women.

In this essay, I first interrogate the physical space that women writers occupy in *LPM*; compare *LPM* to other contemporary publications, in terms of creating a

space for women writers (and readers); and consider *LPM*'s contribution to the canonisation of eminent women writers in the late eighteenth century. In the second part, I consider the poetry itself. I examine Harrison's own poetic contributions in order to establish, in his own words, what 'species of poetry he wishes to see cultivated' (*LPM* 2 (1781): 1). I turn to the authoresses to explore how these writers defi ne themselves, their voice, their space – both in familiar poems that had already been published extensively before *LPM*, and in the poetry original to it. I elucidate ways in which these women perform self-circumscription and attempt self-liberation. While financial prosperity was a real and pressing concern, Harrison did not allow commercial anxieties prevent him from fashioning a space for women writers to contest and challenge conventional authorial female-ness.[3]

LPM vs Contemporary Publications

The 13–16 January 1781 issue of the *London Chronicle* advertised the first edition of 'A New Magazine for the Ladies' (issue 3764: 53). The material would be 'Selected in the manner of Mr. Dodsley's celebrated Collection.' It cost one shilling per number, published monthly, with six numbers making up each volume (*London Chronicle* issue 3976 (23–5 May 1782): 499). Harrison states that it was called *LPM* for two reasons: first, 'because it will not contain a single article improper for the perusal of the fair sex'; and second, crucially, 'because it will include the productions of the Ladies, which are wholly omitted in all the editions of the Poets, though many of them would obtain infinite honour to the most distinguished writers of the other sex' (issue 3764: 53). Harrison might have had in mind compendious anthologies such as William Creech's *British Poets* (1773–6) or Samuel Johnson's recent *Lives of the Poets* (1779–81), which only included male authors. It was not strictly true, however, that women were 'wholly omitted' from poetical collections: Robert Shiells's *Lives of the Poets* (1753), for instance, contains several women; and James Elphinston's *Collection of Poems, From the Best Authors* (1764) includes poems by Anne Finch and Judith Cowper/Madan. Harrison wanted to plug the gap, and remedy female exclusion from the literary sphere; or, at least, he wanted to advertise *LPM* as filling a perceivable gap in the market, by promoting it as rectifying a dearth. Overall, 'The whole [of *LPM* will] comprehend … a complete library of entertaining poetry'; thus, Harrison makes it clear that women's poetry must be included in order to have 'a complete library'.

The implication of the assertion that female authors rank alongside 'the most distinguished writers of the other sex' is that male readers should read their poetry too. The *LPM* 'is therefore equally calculated for the amusement of the Ladies, and of all such Gentlemen as are rational enough to prefer the elegant and entertaining, to the dull, licentious, and uninteresting parts of poetry'. An appeal to male readers was not in itself unusual. The first issue of Jasper Goodwill's *Ladies Magazine: or, the Universal Entertainer* (1749–53), for example, declared itself a 'profitable Entertainment for young Masters and Misses' (1 (18 Nov 1749): 1). However, the later *Lady's Magazine; or Entertaining Companion for the Fair Sex* – which was first published a decade before *LPM* and outlived Harrison's publication (1770–1832) – was targeted explicitly at female readers. Its 'Address to the Fair Sex' noted that: 'The press groans with monthly collections calculated for the peculiar entertainment or improvement of men … it is something surprising that no periodical production should at present exist calculated for your particular amusement' (1 (Aug 1770): 2). Perhaps to distinguish *LPM* from

the *Lady's Magazine*, or perhaps so as not to discourage potential male purchasers, Harrison stressed that the *LPM* was 'equally calculated' for both sexes. Further evidence that Harrison wanted to emphasise *LPM* as a collection of poetical beauties comes from the way in which its subtitle, *Beauties of British Poetry*, appears more prominently throughout than the title's first half: at the top of each page of the body of *LPM* is, written in capitals, 'BEAUTIES OF POETRY'; and the layout on the title page has the second half emboldened to a much greater extent, and in a clearer font, than the first half.

Those who contributed to *LPM* viewed its remit in similar terms. In the preface to her *Letters and Essays, Moral and Miscellaneous* (1793), Mary Hays wrote that 'The Invocation to the Nightingale (*LPM* 2 (1781): 464–5) has been inserted in Harrison's Collection of British Poetry' (1793: ix–x). Hays's poem was original to *LPM*, and her first published item (Walker 2006: 23–4). Clearly, she viewed herself as having contributed to a publication that emphasised collecting 'British Poetry' above poetry only for 'Ladies'; she does not refer to it as a magazine specifically for women. So why affix 'Lady's Poetical Magazine' to the title at all? Harrison may have had a commercial motive, given the ever-expanding market of female readers; Johnson had remarked on 29 April 1778, rather disparagingly, that 'all our ladies read now, which is a great extension' (Boswell 1980: 979). Harrison was nothing if not 'economically astute' (Taylor 1993: 637). Other previous publishers had used the idea of branding collections as being for 'ladies' as a marketing ploy. Despite its title, for instance, the *Ladies Miscellany*, dated 1718, contains only one poem by a woman – 'Ode to Hygeia' by 'Mrs [Susanna] Centlivre' – and seems merely to have been a ruse for repackaging and eking out a profit from Edmund Curll's unsold stock, and an advertising platform for other books he had recently published.[4] Harrison might also have promoted his production as a 'Magazine' to tap into the growing demand for publications with the title: having plateaued between 1760 and 1780, the number of publications entitled 'Magazine' increased by half again in 1790, and doubled in 1800.[5]

Harrison differentiated *LPM* from other productions on the market in numerous ways: for instance, he set out to demarcate women's space in *LPM* by attributing the author and her/his sex to each and every contribution, which was not standard practice at the time. In *Collection of the Best Modern Poems* (1771), for instance, no authors are ascribed, only each poem's title, including poems that are also in *LPM* (such as Elizabeth Carter's 'Written at Midnight in a Thunder Storm' and David Mallet's 'Edwin and Emma'). Elsewhere, the sex of authors was not plainly delineated. In Dodsley's *Collection of Poems*, for example, 'Town Eclogues' (1748, vol. 3: 274–98) is listed as 'By the Right Hon. L. M. W. M.', so attention is not drawn to the fact that she is female. This contrasts with *LPM* (4 (1782): 182–200), which states that the poem is 'By Lady Mary Wortley Montague [*sic*].' Harrison ascribes a gendered identity to the poem's author, whereas Dodsley does not. The vast majority of poems contributed to miscellanies during the long eighteenth century were not attributed: of the 40,000 poems entered into the *Digital Miscellanies Index*, 16,006 (40 per cent) are unattributed. By contrast, the name, and gender, of all contributors to *LPM* is explicit.[6] In providing gendered attributions for all the selected poems, Harrison is making a decided statement: both that women merit space in such collections, and that their identities deserve to be celebrated publicly. In his 'Postscript', Harrison explains, rather mealy-mouthedly, the reason behind his decision:

> From a conviction that the Publick are in general desirous to be acquainted with those who endeavour to contribute to their entertainment, the Editor of this Collection has as much as possible gratified a curiosity … by affixing to each production the NAME of its respective Author[.] (*LPM* 4 (1782): 475)

In a review of *LPM* that appeared in Harrison's *British Magazine* for May 1783 (2: 357–9), the writer, probably Harrison himself, remarked that *LPM*, by affixing to each production the name of its respective author, was 'Contrary to all other collections we have hitherto seen.' Harrison might have been rather disingenuous in claiming that *LPM* differs from 'all other collections', but he continues the tone of the advertisement by maintaining his conviction that the public should be acquainted with female authors.

Although trailblazing to some extent, then, Harrison was not the first male editor to proclaim that women deserved an equal literary status with men. In 1755, George Colman and Bonnell Thornton had produced a poetical anthology, *Poems by Eminent Ladies* (hereafter *PEL*-1755), which was the first substantial collection of women's poetry (Lavoie 2009: 55). In the introduction, the editors stated that they wanted the compendium to be 'proof that great abilities are not confined to the men' and that 'genius often glows with equal warmth … in the breast of a female' (1 (1755): iii). Not everyone welcomed the innovation. In its only known review (Forster 1990: 69), an anonymous response in the *Monthly Review* for June 1755 was dismissive: the entire review reads: 'As the materials that compose these volumes are collected from books, &c. formerly printed, and most of them very common, we need say nothing more of them' (12: 512). As its name suggests, *PEL*-1755 only included poetry 'by' women. The editors claim the 'remarkable circumstance, that there is scarce one Lady, who has contributed to fill these volumes, who was not celebrated by her contemporary poets … [the all male] … *Cowley*, *Dryden*, *Roscommon*, *Creech*, *Pope*, or *Swift*' (1755, vol. 1: iii). The implication is not so much that it should be a 'remarkable circumstance' that women poets were 'celebrated' by renowned, male, poets; but that 'celebrated' authoresses should now have to be reintroduced to the public. Of course, however, using the authority of eminent men to judge the worth of the poetesses still works to enshrine the standard that men and their approbation measure poetry and its success. *PEL*-1755 grouped all poems alphabetically by author, and included a biography of each author at the beginning of every section. Perhaps the reason for affixing biographies was to expand knowledge of these authors beyond the limited coterie of 'contemporary poets', into the wider sphere of the reading public. In contrast, *LPM* does not group its entries together by author – or, seemingly, any other organised structure – and neither does it include a biography for any author, either female or male, whether previously unpublished or a household name. Lavoie argues that Colman and Thornton used organisation by surname, introductory paragraphs, and exegetic footnotes (all revolutionary editorial choices in 1755) to raise the status of the women poets they included and, concomitantly, themselves (2009: 64–7). Harrison's omission of biography, on the other hand, suggests that he was less concerned with the lives of the individual authors per se, and was more interested in fashioning a space in which poetry by women and men visibly sat alongside each other, thus equalising their status.

The editors of *PEL*-1755 and *LPM* may have had a financial motivation for marketing their books to women, but this does not mean that they were not also attempting to fashion a literary space for women writers and readers. Not all editors of poetical collections targeted at 'ladies' evinced any such concern. We might, for instance, compare a work that appeared roughly in between these two: Oliver Goldsmith's *Poems for Young Ladies* (1767; hereafter *PYL*). Goldsmith divides the poems into three parts, 'Devotional, Moral, and Entertaining', the order of which is telling in 'comprehending the three great duties of life' (iv). The book is '*for*' young ladies, and definitely not '*by*' young ladies. Indeed, women are completely denied a literary space in Goldsmith's anthology: its title proclaims it to be '*a Collection of the Best Pieces in Our Language*', yet not a single one is by a woman. The *Monthly Review*, which had been so sniffy about *PEL*-1755 only including poems 'formerly printed', had no such qualms about Goldsmith's collection. Rather, the opposite was the case. The *Monthly*'s review of *PYL*, in March 1767, happily lists several of the well-known poems included, and promotes them as 'pieces as innocence may read without a blush' (36 (Mar 1767): 240). Despite billing themselves as *for* women, *PYL*, Curll, and their ilk, underplay writing *by* women. Harrison seems to be unusual in insisting more than most contemporaries that women readers should be able to experience good work composed by others of their sex. Goldsmith sets out his agenda for *PYL* in the preface: he claims that an unwitting young lady will read the volume seduced by the idea of being amused, but will be duped into acquiring knowledge; 'while she courts only entertainment, [she will] be deceived into wisdom' (iii). The preface opens by stating:

> Doctor Fordyce's excellent Sermons for young women in some measure gave rise to the following compilation. In that work, where he so judiciously points out all the defects of female conduct to remedy them, and all the proper studies which they should pursue, with a view to improvement, Poetry is one to which he particularly would attach them. (iii)

Fordyce's *Sermons to Young Women* had been published in the previous year (1766). Goldsmith follows Fordyce's prescriptions precisely in including only male writers. 'Your business chiefly is to read Men', Fordyce instructed, 'in order to make yourselves agreeable and useful' and 'lead to your principal ends as Women' (1766, vol. 2: 11). Making oneself 'agreeable and useful', presumably to men, was what Fordyce considered the majority of women's reading should encompass. 'Poetry of all kinds' is recommended, but only 'where a strict regard is paid to decorum' (1766, vol. 2: 16). We might guess how Jane Austen felt, a generation later, about Fordyce's *Sermons* from her decision to have the pompous and sanctimonious Mr Collins, in *Pride and Prejudice* (1813), read it aloud to provide 'instruction' to the Bennet daughters (2004: 52). Although Austen elsewhere admired Goldsmith's own work, in editing *PYL* he might well be among those against whom she railed in *Northanger Abbey* (1818), as 'the man who collects and publishes in a volume some dozen lines of Milton, Pope, and Prior, with a paper from the Spectator', and imagines that he should be 'eulogized by a thousand pens' (2003: 23). John Milton and Alexander Pope are included in *PYL*, and three Joseph Addison poems that Goldsmith includes were originally from the *Spectator* (1711–12; 1714).[7] Perhaps rather surprisingly, given his palpable hostility to female authorship, Goldsmith was sometime editor of the *Lady's Magazine; or Polite Companion for*

the Fair Sex (1759–63). One should also point out, however, that Harrison's collection hardly represents a radical departure in its choice of male authors. *LPM* includes more than a quarter of the poems, and most of the authors, featured in *PYL*. Of the thirty poems in *PYL*, eight are included in *LPM*; of the nineteen men in the former, sixteen also appear in the latter.

There is also overlap between the contents of *PEL*-1755 and *LPM*: of the eighteen poetesses featured in *PEL*-1755, exactly one-third (six) feature in *LPM*. In total, the authors who had appeared in *PEL*-1755 contribute ten poems to *LPM*. Lavoie argues that Harrison 'borrowed older materials from the first edition of *PEL* to include in *LPM*' (1999: 279). That is unfair to Harrison, though, since he only re-used three poems from *PEL*-1755, all of them well known and popular.[8] If anything, Harrison's choices suggest that he was trying to create a space for female writers different from that established in *PEL*-1755. This is further evidenced by the fact that there are a number of original poems contributed by women writers to *LPM*: of the thirty-three poems by women included overall, I deduce that seven of them were original (or, at least, seldom or scarce enough printed that they would be unfamiliar to readers), which is over a fifth. Unlike *PEL*-1755, which aimed to include poetry by relatively 'celebrated' authors (vol. 1: iii), originality was one of Harrison's stated aims. In the *London Chronicle* advertisement for 13–16 January 1781, he had promised that *LPM* would include 'a great variety of original pieces' (issue 3764: 53). In calling it a 'Magazine', Harrison highlights *LPM*'s inclusion of 'original pieces' alongside reprinted content (a characteristic of most magazines of the period). Although in some ways Harrison broadly adhered to standard contemporary editorial practices, then, he was unusual in situating original poetry attributed to women alongside celebrated, well-known poetry by men; implying, albeit obliquely, that contemporary female poets should be considered as equals to, and aspire to the reputations of, well-established male authors. A poem I surmise is original to *LPM*, titled 'On A Supposed Slight from A Friend' by 'Miss Roberts' (2 (1871): 189–90), for example, appears in the same volume as Pope's 'Universal Prayer' (2 (1781): 15–16) and Milton's 'Lycidas' (2 (1781): 410–16).[9] Of course, in some ways providing a space for women authors in which they are seen to stand shoulder to shoulder with men can be seen as proto-feminist in implying equality between the sexes; but, on the other hand, it again supposes that poetry by men is the standard by which women poets should also be measured.

LPM influenced subsequent volumes aimed at women, which capitalised on the platform forged by Harrison. In the mid-1780s, an expanded edition of *PEL*-1755, *Poems by the Most Eminent Ladies of Great Britain and Ireland*, which claimed to have made 'considerable Alterations, Additions, and Improvements', was 'Re-Published' (hereafter *PEL*-c.1785).[10] *PEL*-c.1785 clearly used *LPM* as a template. Only five poems by women in *LPM* did not appear in *PEL*-c.1785 (and all the poems in *LPM* which appear to be original are transposed into *PEL*-c.1785). There is only one female author in *LPM* who does not also provide material for *PEL*-c.1785 (Elizabeth Tollet). If it were not clear from the content of the two publications that *PEL*-c.1785 lifted material from *LPM*, then it would be evident from their shared typographical idiosyncrasies. Both, for example, attribute 'Invocation to the Nightingale' to 'Miss Heys' (*LPM* 2 (1781): 464–5; *PEL*-c.1785, vol. 1: 109–10). She would go on to publish various works as 'Mary Hays', of which the most radical was an *Appeal to the Men of Great Britain in Behalf of Women* (1798). Additionally, both have peculiar attributions of Mary

Whateley/Darwall.[11] *LPM*, therefore, helped to fashion a space for women's poetry distinct from that of previously established, 'eminent', women, in part by containing voices unheard of before. This space was later colonised by the offspring of that mid-century publication; *PEL*-c.1785 attracted 396 subscribers, including 'cultural luminaries' such as Joshua Reynolds and Horace Walpole (Suarez 2001: 225). Ezell has identified that the two *PEL* 'volumes prepare the way for the later nineteenth-century critics' and anthologists' demarcation of a "feminine" literary sphere' (1993: 117). *LPM* was foundational, then, in contributing to the canonising of 'eminent' women writers at the end of the eighteenth century.

In highlighting women's right to share public literary space with men, Harrison might have had noble aims, but the content did not entirely match the rhetoric.[12] In the first volume (1781), ten of the eighty-four poems are by women (11.9 per cent). Of the 474 pages on which poetry appears, poetry by women appears on only thirty-seven of them (7.8 per cent). In contrast, Mallet's 'Amyntor and Theodora' covers more pages than all the women's entries combined (1 (1781): 218–58 and therefore forty-one pages or 8.6 per cent). In the second volume (also 1781), six of the sixty-one poems are by women (9.8 per cent). Of 476 pages on which poetry appears, poetry by women appears on only fourteen of them (a miniscule 2.9 per cent). Harrison's own poem, 'Albina and Lothario', covers the same number of pages (2 (1781): 1–14), despite claiming in its 'Advertisement' that it was merely a 'little piece'. Along with Harrison, there are six other male authors whose poems cover the same, or a greater, number of pages. In the third volume (1782), a paltry three of seventy-eight poems are by women (3.8 per cent). Of 474 pages on which poetry appears, poetry by women appears on only eleven of them (an even more miniscule 2.3 per cent). Volume 4 (also 1782), however, is better in terms of female inclusion: fourteen of sixty-four poems are by women (21.9 per cent). Of 474 pages on which poetry appears, poetry by women appears on eighty-one of them (17.1 per cent). Perhaps the space afforded women is greatest in the final volume because Harrison was, by then, more sure of his readership. Or, perhaps Harrison had, by then, included most of the men he felt he had to incorporate; an impression also created by his *Novelist's Magazine* (1780–8). A similar pattern emerges from the content of the *Novelist's Magazine*, of which Rees estimates that 'at one time 12,000 copies of each number were sold, weekly' (1896: 22). There, no contribution states it is by a woman until Vol. IX (when Sarah Fielding's *David Simple* (1744) makes an appearance). In the final volume, however, four of the six novels are by women.[13] In *LPM*, the overall percentage of poems by women is 11.5 per cent. In each of the four volumes of the *LPM*, the percentage of pages covered by the writing of a female poet is less than the number of poems contributed by women, which means that Harrison chose shorter contributions by women. There are over 144 male authors, but only twenty-two women authors in total; which means that there are almost seven male authors for each female one. That might look like lopsided representation, and indeed it is, but one must consider the context. Of the 3,984 different authors whom the *Digital Miscellanies Index* has so far identified as having contributed to eighteenth-century miscellanies, 302 writers are known to be women (7.6 per cent). In other words, Harrison allotted in *LPM* a larger space (by almost one-third) for women's poetry than seems to have been the norm.

Women and their Writing within the *Lady's Poetical Magazine*

Perhaps Harrison also chose to call his production a 'Magazine' as a signpost for how readers should engage with its contents. In a poetical 'Magazine', the meaning of individual poems is re-mediated by their juxtaposition with those that precede and succeed them. How do the poems across the volumes of *LPM* speak to each other, and what are we to take from these engagements? The May 1783 review of *LPM*, in Harrison's *British Magazine*, determines to leave it to readers to 'judge of [Harrison's] claim to a place in the Temple of the Muses from … The four introductory poems', affixed to the beginning of each volume (2: 357). This review, despite the writer's protestations against any 'suspicion of … partiality', was a puff piece designed to advertise Harrison and *LPM*. The *British Magazine* claims that 'The first of these poems at once points allegorically to the nature of the Collection' (2: 327). *LPM*'s 'Introductory Address' (1 (1781): 1–4) opens by stating that women have been denied their 'rightful' place as creatures who have valuable minds:

> Too long has Man, engrossing ev'ry art,
> Dar'd to reject the Female's rightful part;
> As if to him, alone, had been confin'd,
> Heav'n's greatest gift, a scientifick mind.
> (1 (1781): 1)

Harrison explicitly inserts his production into the discussion that had raged throughout eighteenth-century publications: whether or not women were inherently different from men in what they were capable of mastering, and, as a corollary, whether or not literature for and by women should therefore be confined to particular 'sexed' spheres. The question at stake, in other words, was whether women should write about putatively 'masculine' topics, such as matters 'scientifick'. In *Tatler* no. 172 (16 May 1710), Richard Steele had written:

> I am sure, I do not mean it an Injury to Women, when I say there is a Sort of Sex in Souls … the Soul of a Man and that of a Woman are made very unlike, according to the Employments for which they are designed. (2: 444)

The term 'Sex in Souls' was subsequently taken up by other periodicals when discussing women and writing (Shevelow 1989: 93–101, 155–9, 173–4). Thus, Harrison is directly opposing himself to Steele when he writes, 'let the smooth and tranquil paths to [poetic] fame … Be, as the soul, to neither sex confin'd.' Provocatively, he continues: 'Where is the wretch' who would 'deny' that 'female skill with boasted man's may vie!', daring readers to repudiate this claim. 'Then why', he asks confrontationally, 'refuse them [women] to an equal share?' In using 'them', women are still othered; the voice is male, speaking to men. While Harrison's assertion that past treatment of women was 'Unjust', and should be regarded with 'shame' suggests that he promotes a female-friendly agenda, nevertheless he retains the traditional model, of active masculinity and passive femininity, in suggesting that men should 'let' women 'share the road to fame' (1 (1781): 1–2). This refrain, that women should be allowed – 'let' – to do things by men, is repeated throughout *LPM* in poetry authored by both sexes.[14] It is perhaps most peculiarly played out in Anna Laetitia Aikin's/Barbauld's 'The Mouse's Petition' (1 (1781): 423–5), which finishes with the lines: 'Let not thy strong oppressive force / A free-born mouse detain' (1 (1781): 425). Even in this call to

recognise living creatures as 'free-born', the speaker still entreats, in a supplicatory, submissive tone, to 'Let' the 'free-born' be free (see Ready 2004).

'Happy for England', Harrison continues, 'were each female mind, / To science more, and less to pomp inclin'd' (1 (1781): 2). Here Harrison again uses language that had long been part of the discussion about what is desirable in women. A decade later, in *Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (1792) Mary Wollstonecraft would also lament that 'cumberous pomp supplied the place of domestic affections', believing that 'it is not the enchantment of literary pursuits, or the steady investigation of scientific subjects, that leads women astray from duty' (1995: 232, 265). Harrison holds up Queen Charlotte, wife of George III, as an exemplar of 'the flame of virtue'. Charlotte was a prolific, wide-ranging reader: her library eventually numbered more than 40,000 volumes, in various languages, and in subjects including theology, philosophy, travel, history, belles-lettres, and science (Campbell Orr 2002). Harrison then declares of the Queen, 'Behold, in HER, a scientifick wife!' (1 (1781): 2). So, while the poem opens by boldly stating that 'a scientifick mind' should be 'to neither sex confin'd', it justifies this by reference to traditional gendered roles. As Hansen notes, Harrison reintroduces the concept of gender, the importance of which had been denied in the previous lines (2013: 54). But he was not unusual, for his time, in advocating female advancement while concomitantly assuming gender stereotypes: Wollstonecraft also promoted female education on the grounds that it would make women better wives and mothers. Harrison's approval of women's capability in scientific fields is supported by his inclusion of Tollet's 'Microcosm' (4 (1782): 431–8), with its scientific references; for example, to Robert Hooke's illustrations of insects in *Micrographia*, 1665, 'in the microscope thou canst descry / The gnat's sharp spear, the muscles of a fly' (4 (1782): 435; see Fara 2002).

Harrison closes the 'Introductory Address' by self-consciously referring to the 'Great … task' that he has 'assign'd' himself in creating *LPM*: he describes the 'task', of plucking up all the best poetry without leaving anything that could be potentially corrupting, as being like weeding a garden; he must 'traverse Nature's garden all around', and not 'leave a single flow'r … Which owns a scent less fragrant than the air; / Least it's foul breath contaminate the whole, / And … poison of the soul' (1 (1781): 3). Using lapsarian imagery, he promises there will be no devilish snakes in the grass, so that 'howev'r incautiously she tread', the female reader cannot 'place her foot upon the adder's head' (1 (1781): 4). With self-congratulation, Harrison exhorts his readers, to 'view' his 'skilful' work 'With rapture' and 'deem' it to be 'a blessing to the Fair!' (1 (1781): 4). As elsewhere, traditional imagery is reinforced; female readers will be chaperoned through the 'garden' of *LPM*, and will not be permitted the – potentially dangerous – freedom of an Eve.

Harrison's poem anticipates John Duncombe's 'Feminead; Or, Female Genius' (4 (1782): 463–74), the final poem in *LPM*'s final volume – the two acting like bookends – which is an encomium in praise of women poets, and criticises 'lordly man', the 'Tyrant of verse' who denies 'the female right' to 'the Muse's tributary bay' (4 (1782): 463). The way Duncombe suggests that men should 'Admire', 'praise', and 'Tell' women that they 'charm', 'shine', and are 'divine' (4 (1782): 463) is, however, couched in decorous, objectifying terms. Duncombe insists that we do not need to

'rove' 'from our own Britain' to find female 'genius', although he praises Sappho, the Ancient Greek poetess, for her 'tuneful lyre' (4 (1782): 466). Sappho is also the only female poet mentioned in Madan's 'Progress of Poetry' (1 (1781): 135–43), which the *Monthly Review* for April 1783 judged to be 'a muster-roll of some of the principal poets in chronological order, from Homer down to [George] Granville and [Nicholas] Rowe' (68: 356). The review does not question that 'the principal poets' of the country do not include a single woman. Duncombe expressly approves Madan's 'polish'd taste', noting that 'Praise well-bestow'd adorns her glowing lines' (4 (1782): 469). Cowper/Madan was obviously proud of Duncombe's comments; she transcribed his lines about her into her commonplace book (MS.Eng. misc.d.636). It is worth noting here that *LPM* also includes a poem, 'Verses Addressed to Mrs Digby' (2 (1781): 461–3), by 'Mrs Collier', seemingly original, which celebrates another British woman's poetry.[15] Echoing Duncombe's praise of Madan's 'polish', Collier aspires to 'reach' Elizabeth Carter's 'polish'd' and 'charming line[s]': 'O Carter! could I reach thy polish'd verse' (2 (1781): 463). At the close of 'Feminead', Duncombe meets a 'maid' who praises him for writing the first poem to champion the female poet's 'cause':

> be this thy praise and pride,
> That thou, of all the numerous tuneful throng,
> First in our cause hast fram'd thy gen'rous song.
> (4 (1782): 474)

He thus implies that women should be grateful for the attention he has shown them. Jones argues that 'Duncombe's *Feminiad* … though celebratory, contributes to an aesthetic orthodoxy' (1990: 141). While it, too, celebrates female writers, Harrison's poem, likewise, ultimately propounds a conventional view of gender relations.

As Bonnell has noted, Harrison's poems in volumes 2 to 4 describe the traditional arc of a woman's life, from premarital, to connubial, to maternal concerns (2008: 323). In its prefatory 'Advertisement', Harrison remarks that 'Albina and Lothario; Or, The Fatal Seduction. A Moral Tale' is 'a specimen of that species of poetry he wishes to see cultivated by persons of superior genius and learning'. Note the gender neutrality of 'persons'. Albina's is a cautionary tale for female readers, 'Approach your Poet—fain would he relate, / (To guard from ills like her's) Albina's fate' (2 (1781): 2); equally, it is a cautionary tale for male readers, 'But, to compleat the purpose of these rhymes, / And shun Lothario's woes—avoid his crimes!' (2 (1781): 2). Lothario seduces, impregnates, then abandons, Albina; presented as a thoughtless cad, he wastes his time and money on women, wine, and gambling. In describing Lothario as unable to 'see … the latent thorn beneath the flow'rs' (2 (1781): 7), Harrison harks back to his own 'Introductory Address', in which he claimed that in *LPM* 'each fair-one may adorn / Her brow with roses, fearless of the thorn' (1 (1781): 3), because potential 'thorn[s]' have been expunged. Thus, Harrison rates men and women as equally susceptible to being pricked by a hidden 'thorn' among flowers. In this poem, Harrison counters the implication within his 'Introductory Address' that only Eves are susceptible to nasties hidden in gardens. Within his own poems, then, Harrison encourages readers to read across volumes in order to challenge apparent meanings.

In ‘Conjugal Felicity’ (3 (1782): 1–13), Harrison describes parents educating their children. The wife, with conventional feminine meekness and admiration:

> with mute attentions sits,
> And hears her little family receive
> The seeds of virtue and of science mix’d,
> Instructive, by the skilful father’s care[.]
> (3 (1782): 6)

Although ‘mute’ during this lesson, elsewhere, she does not ‘neglect to give advice, / Such as she can’ (3 (1782): 6). Harrison qualifi es her abilities in teaching: she gives guidance ‘Such as she can.’ The poem also describes how Britons should be proper patriots, and revere the:

> firm protectors of their country’s rights,
> When despots would have made a heavy yoke,
> And bow’d them to the earth!
> (3 (1782): 4)

‘Dunnotter Castle’ (1 (1781): 200–3) is attributed to ‘Miss Scott’. She has been mistakenly identified as Mary Scott (Holladay 1984: x (f.2)), but it is in fact by Susan Scott, later Carnegie (1743–1821). It had been published in another collection, *Lessons in Reading* (1780) only a year before it appeared in *LPM*.[16] The poem recounts a moment of triumph in the castle’s history, when, during the Civil War, Ogilvie of Barras, Dunnottar’s lieutenant-governor, refused to surrender to Cromwell’s forces.

> Illustrious Caledonians, patriots bold!
> With joy your heroism I rehearse,
> And give your mem’ry all I can—a verse.
> (1 (1781):201)

Scott/Carnegie celebrates those who are ‘patriots bold’; but instead of doing something heroic herself, she does ‘all I can’, which is ‘rehearse’ the ‘heroism’ of others in ‘verse’, insinuating that the way young women can be ‘patriots’ is to live vicariously through the ‘mem’ry’ of such ‘heroism’. When she invokes to her ‘aid’ the ‘Muse’ of ‘flowing verse’, Scott/Carnegie adopts a traditional feminine passivity in describing her writing.

Scott’s/Carnegie’s poem celebrated, in verse, past glories; in his poem in the final volume – ‘A Monody to the Memory of the Seven Innocents … Who Were Consumed by Fire … January 18, 1782’ (4 (1782): 1–5) – Harrison laments present distress through alluding to past verse. This fi re actually occurred, so this poem would have felt very contemporary to readers. The poem opens, ‘Ah! whither, “goddess of the tearful eye,” / Sadly mournful dost thou stray’ (4 (1782): 1). The quotation might be from James Grainger’s poem, ‘Solitude’, which appeared in the previous volume (3 (1782): 436–44; 441). Harrison may also be alluding to Joseph Warton’s well-known ‘Ode to Fancy’, which referred to ‘matron Melancholy, / Goddess of the tearful eye’ (Dodsley 1748, vol. 3: 78–84; 80–1). Melancholy was often characterised as feminine in eighteenth-century poetry – another example is

'Black Melancholy' in Pope's 'Eloisa to Abelard', 1717 (*Twickenham*, vol. 2: 333 (l.165)) – hence, in referring to Melancholy as 'goddess', Harrison's poem is in keeping with the predominant gendering of this affliction, which continues into, for example, John Keats's depiction in 'Ode on Melancholy' (1820). 'Effusions of Melancholy' (1 (1781): 443–4) by 'Miss Roberts' (which appears to be original to *LPM*), reverses this with melancholic 'black Despair' characterised as a male 'tyrant', to whose 'will' she is 'Obedient':

> That gloomy tyrant now resumes his seat,
> O'er my sad soul extends his racking sway;
> Obedient to his will my pulses beat[.]
> (1 (1781): 443)

Roberts is oppressed by masculine Melancholy; the only respite she foresees is death, where she will 'Reach the bright mansions of eternal rest' (1 (1781): 444). Despite this reversal, however, both poems ultimately reinforce traditional gender stereotypes: Harrison's feminine Melancholy is a 'Dear Sympathetick maid' (4 (1782): 2); Roberts's masculine Melancholy is aggressive and overbearing, and leaves her feeling 'suppress'd' (1 (1781): 443).

More generally speaking, in *LPM*, conformist, conventional rhetoric is not confined to male writers. Sally Carter's 'Hymn to Prosperity' (3 (1782): 257), which seems to be an original contribution, is a banal catalogue of the qualities she aspires to possess:

> O bless me with an honest mind,
> Above all selfish ends;
> Humanely warm to all mankind,
> And cordial to my friends[.]
> (3 (1782): 257)

Meanwhile, Elizabeth Rowe's popular 'Love and Friendship' (4 (1782): 298–300) stages a dialogue in which two women discuss whether female friendship or romantic love should be one's muse. That these two women have a right to, and are perfectly capable to write, poetry is taken as read; and yet still, Rowe's poem would circumscribe women's poetic space. That women's poetry might encompass other topics, like politics or war, is ostensibly inconceivable.

Other contributions, however, explicitly push against acceptance of conventions, such as Wortley Montagu's 'Town Eclogues' (4 (1782): 182–200), which was ironically described as 'too womanish' by Horace Walpole (Grundy 1999: 417).[17] This poem jousts with Pope's 'Rape of the Lock' (*LPM* 3 (1782): 192–215) – and, while Wortley Montagu was less censorious than Pope was of women who lived with double binds she understood, nevertheless, she was equally as sharp a critic of the society in which they lived (Grundy 2006: 184–96). In 'Rape of the Lock', Thalestris rages against the futility of the labour that Belinda has put into her toilette in the famous lines:

> Was it for this you took such constant care
> The bodkin, comb, and essence to prepare?
> For this your locks in paper durance bound?

> For this with tort'ring irons wreath'd around?
> For this with fillets strain'd your tender head,
> And bravely bore the double loads of lead?
> (3 (1782): 208–9)

Wortley Montagu alludes to these lines, when Roxana, a rebuffed member of 'the court', asks: 'Was it for this, that I these roses wear, / For this new-set the jewels for my hair?' (4 (1782): 183). Her poem is a satire on those who seek preferment at the expense of their own sense of self, 'For thee, ah! what for thee did I resign? / My pleasures, passions, all that e'er was mine' (4 (1782): 183). In 'Rape of the Lock', Pope plays with eighteenth-century conventions of Virgilian epic translation in the construction 'Was it for this' – the same convention that William Wordsworth later developed in the opening line of his two-part *Prelude* (Hodgson 1991). There was, by the eighteenth century, a convention in English translations of the *Aeneid* to formulate Anna's exclamation at her sister Dido's suicide thus. In the popular eighteenth-century translation by Joseph Trapp, for instance, Anna asks 'Was it for This, / My Sister?' (1731, vol. 2: 274 (bk IV, ll. 895–6)). Pope undermines Belinda by linguistically comparing her plight with Dido's.[18] Pope draws on eighteenth-century conventions of language for epic translation, in order to stretch the play of his 'mock-heroick'; similarly, Wortley Montagu uses the same formal construction to riff on Pope's mockery in her mock-georgic poem. Wortley Montagu shows off her poetic credentials by manipulating 'high' literary forms and engaging in politics.

Other writers within *LPM* might not be as overt as Wortley Montagu, but their commitment to contesting gender-norms should not be overlooked. Frances Greville's 'Prayer for Indifference' (*LPM* 1 (1781): 183–5) was, according to Lonsdale, 'the most celebrated poem by a woman in the period' (1989: 190); and yet it challenged one of the fundamental aspects of accepted femininity: sensibility (see McGann 1996: 50–4; and Ingram 2011: 79–80). The eighteenth century saw the two become inextricably linked (see Ellis 1996); as, for example, when Fordyce enjoined women to exercise 'virtuous sensibility on your part' (1766, vol. 1: 53). Greville's poem is sometimes described as a response to her difficult relationship with her husband (Burney 1889, vol. 1: 26). She examines the deep paradox of sensibility: that those 'who have most to love have most to lose' (in Hannah More's words, in *Sensibility* (1782: 281), in response to Greville's poem). Instead, Greville resolves: 'Half-pleas'd, contented will I be, / Content but half to please' (1 (1782): 185). This couplet breaks in half, with each line serving to highlight the injustice of a woman's position: the first half concerns a woman *being* pleased, the second with a woman pleasing *others*. The first line shows the position that many women have to put up with – that they must choose to accept being 'contented' with what makes them only 'Half-pleas'd'. The second, more controversial statement, is saying that from now on she will be 'Content … to please' others only by 'half' (especially her husband). Fordyce extols in woman 'an example equally unexceptionable and pleasing' (1766, vol. 1: 50); Greville subverts the idea that women should seek fully 'to please'. Together these lines challenge the double standard contained in the inequality of society's expectations about giving and receiving pleasure. Greville herself seems to have projected, perhaps even cultivated, a 'masculine' aura: her god-daughter, the novelist Fanny Burney, remarked that 'Her understanding was truly masculine' (1832, vol. 1: 56). Greville rejected oppressive femininity, as can be deduced from her unpublished, semi-

autobiographical novel, in which Mrs Castletown defends female rationality, in a dialogue with the unpleasant Sir James Saville. Saville opines that he 'hate[s] Sensible Women, & learned Women … Their learning is always inferior to that of a School Boy, & their Sense answers no purpose but to make them presumptuous and dogmatical. They have nothing to do but to be pretty, clean & good humoured.' Castletown retorts: '*Obedient* you would have added' (Rizzo 1994: 242). Todd argues that 'Prayer for Indifference' is not 'questioning … sensibility's worth or even … [expressing] … genuine uneasiness at its connection with femininity, but simply an elegant expression of the very quality it decried' (1986: 61). More than this, however, Greville attempts to repudiate sensibility, to critique its dangers, even as she acknowledges that she struggles to do so. In questioning sensibility, Greville is de facto questioning femininity; and thus unsettling those who wished femininity to remain unquestioned.

Isabella Howard responded to Greville with her own poem, 'Fairy's Answer to Mrs Greville' (1 (1781): 186–8), which Harrison placed immediately after 'Prayer for Indifference'. In Lonsdale's words, Howard 'stressed the positive aspects of "sensibility"' (1989: 190). By including Grenville's poem in *LPM*, Harrison opens up possibilities for his female readers to think about the way in which society conditions their 'sensibility'; but, in directly following it with Howard's response, he seems almost immediately to close them down again. The 'spirit' in Howard's poem retorts:

> why she sends a prayer so new
> I cannot understand …
> No grain of cold Indifference
> Was ever yet ally'd to Sense …
> I obey, as others must,
> Those laws which Fate has made …
> [otherwise] what might be the horrid end[.]
> (1 (1781): 187–8)

The spirit concludes:

> I dare not change a first decree,
> She's doom'd to please, nor can be free!
> Such is the lot of Beauty.
> (1 (1781): 188)

At first reading, this poem seems to endorse the status quo and to refute Greville's questioning of a woman's duty 'to please'. Yet the tone somehow pulls against this, the resignation in 'She's doom'd to please … Such is the lot of Beauty' problematises whether this statement is necessarily true. Moreover, by using the word 'Beauty' as a synonym for women, Howard is on one level poking fun at people who see women's only role as adhering to artifi cial notions of 'Beauty', or that women must be viewed as a collective entity. The poem's final lines have the narrative voice remark that the spirit's 'words … Imprinted on my mind' (1 (1781): 188), suggesting that the poet wishes to make a similar impression on readers, who, like Oberon, are left to refl ect on whether they agree with the spirit. Hence, while Lonsdale is correct to say that the spirit, with 'His little voice', might emphasise 'the positive aspects of "sensibility"', it is not clear that

the poem as a whole straightforwardly endorses that view. In fact, the poem 'dare[s]' readers to push against such 'a first decree'. Greville's and Howard's poems stand in contrast to Thomas Pennant's 'Ode to Indifference' (*LPM* 4 (1782): 446–7), which does not *dare* to challenge the idea that 'Indifference' is incompatible with proper femininity: 'Indifference' is 'insipid maid', 'hated maid', 'wanton maid' (4 (1782): 446).

Harrison's encouragement to readers to scrutinise poems' meanings extended beyond *LPM* itself. Toward the end of *LPM*'s final volume is Elizabeth Sophia Tomlins's 'Connal and Mary' (4 (1782): 385–8), apparently original to *LPM*, which seeks to urge readers to dissect assumptions about gender roles and subjectivity in writing and reading poetry. The male lover Connal believes he has been betrayed by Mary: this appears to be a standard tale of the 'wound[ed] … faithful lover' (4 (1782): 387) who has been betrayed by a fickle woman. But the poem was subsequently extended; with what is printed in *LPM* becoming the first part, and a second poem, 'Mary and Connal. A Sequel to Connal and Mary' (1783), detailing Mary's response to Connal's criticisms. The latter was printed in Harrison's *British Magazine* (3 (July 1783): 49), along with a plug for 'Harrison's Collection' (that is, *LPM*; note, again the ungendered presentation).[19] Perhaps Tomlins apprised Harrison of her plans for a sequel when the first poem was published in *LPM*; in any event, the second poem undermines the complacency shown by Connal in the first, and suggests that readers should interrogate the views put forward there.

Despite any financial pressures he was under, in creating *LPM* Harrison fashioned a space for women writers that aspired to a greater level of equality than was usual; to grant 'the Female's rightful part' alongside 'Man' (1 (1781): 1). It is true that there are ways in which *LPM* espoused the conventional. Nonetheless, it was above the average for miscellanies in the amount of women's poetry it included. Moreover, 21 per cent of the poetry by women appears to have been original; in some cases, such as that of Hays and Tomlins, these are the first-time publications of women who would go on to become established writers. Harrison provided a space for female voices unheard before; which was unlike publications, such as *PEL* -1755, which preferred already 'celebrated' authoresses. These previously unheard voices were then incorporated into the 'eminent' writers of *PEL*-c.1785, a significant publication in terms of women's writing anthologies. Both sexes visibly contribute to the 'BEAUTIES OF POETRY'. The attributions, moreover, imply that women deserve a public voice and identity, and should not have to be hidden behind the anonymous sobriquet 'By a Lady'. The divergent views conveyed, across the wide range of poems thrown together cheek by jowl, encourages readers to read them in dialogue with each other, and so compare, assess, agree, or disagree with the disparate stances on display. *LPM* fashions a space that encourages readers, of whichever sex, to read across the volumes to appraise competing ideas of 'female-ness', to evaluate disparate perspectives on what women should write about, and, ultimately, allows them the freedom to draw their own conclusions.

Notes

1. See Rose 1993; Saunders 1992; and Woodmansee and Jaszi 1994.

2. Except where explicit, I use ‘magazine’, ‘miscellany’, ‘anthology’, ‘compendium’, ‘collection’ etc. interchangeably; although I acknowledge the distinctions between them, that is not my focus (see Benedict 1996: 3).
3. Claire Knowles, elsewhere in this volume, examines how newspapers provided sympathetic editorial support likely to encourage women, especially, to pursue literary careers.
4. Despite the title’s claim to originality, it was in fact a collection of works already separately issued (1716–17) bound together, as testified by the non-linear pagination. It includes four pages that list ‘Poetry Lately Published’ ‘All Printed for *E. Curll*’ (1718: approx. 240–3).
5. In 1760, twenty-two British publications were published called ‘Magazine’; in 1770, nineteen; in 1780, eighteen; in 1790, thirty; and in 1800, forty-three (data from Crane and Kaye 1979).
6. Gender can be identified either through titles (‘Miss’, ‘Mrs’, ‘Mr’ etc.), or through the suffi x ‘Esq’, or through the given qualifications that were only available to men (‘Dr’, ‘LLD’, ‘MA’, etc.). Although Mallet’s ‘Amyntor and Theodora’ (1 (1781): 218–58) does not have a specifi ed author, its dedication ‘To Mrs Mallet’, who the first line refers to as ‘faithful partner’ (1 (1781): 218), makes his identity and gender clear.
7. ‘Providence’ is from *Spectator* no. 441; ‘Gratitude’ is from no. 453; and ‘Creation’ is from no. 465.
8. Laetitia Pilkington’s ‘Trial of Constancy’, Lady Mary Wortley Montagu’s ‘Town Eclogues’, and Carter’s ‘To a Gentleman’.
9. It is uncertain who ‘Miss Roberts’ is. Lavoie suggests it might be ‘Rachel Roberts’ (1999: 319). Ashfield has suggested one ‘Elizabeth Roberts’, as well as contributing, actually edited *LPM*, although he provides no evidence for this; Ashfield also suggests that Mary Hays may have co-edited *LPM*, although again, he provides no evidence for this. (1997–8, vol. 1: 29). Another possibility is Radagunda Roberts, who wrote for various magazines, including the *Lady’s Magazine* in the 1770s (see DiPlacidi 2016).
10. The *PEL*-c.1785 title page has no publication date, but does state that it was printed by W. Stafford, known to have been active in the publishing trade in 1784–5 (Suarez 2001: 247 (f.12)). The *ESTC* assigns a date of ‘1785?’ Ostensibly ‘A New Edition’ of *PEL* was published in 1773, although this was actually a reissuing of remaining sheets from 1755 (Suarez 2001: 224).
11. *Ode*, both ascribe to ‘Mrs Darwall’; *Ode to May*, both to ‘Miss Whately’; and, *Pleasures of Contemplation*, *LPM* attributes to ‘Mrs Darwal, formerly Miss Whatley’, *PEL*-c.1785 simply to ‘Miss Whately’; perhaps the spelling mistake meant that the connection was not made. The division is particularly odd in *PEL*-c.1785, which lists her as two separate authors.
12. My counting differs from Bonnell’s (2008: 322). He counts Wortley Montagu’s ‘Town Eclogues’ as six poems, for example, whereas I consider it as one. Likewise, I count William Collins’s ‘Oriental Eclogues’ as one poem. This is because Harrison treats them each as one item in the indices (4 (1782): 476; 2 (1781): 477).
13. Of sixty contributions overall, ten are novels by women (16.7 per cent), and one is a translation of a female writer (1.7 per cent). Thus, contributions by women total 18.4 per cent.
14. See, for example, Whateley’s/Darwall’s ‘Hymn to Solitude’: ‘Then let me range the shadowy lawns’ and ‘Let me invoke the Pastoral Muse’ (1 (1781): 311–13). See

also William Shenstone's 'Pastoral Ballad': 'Nay, on him [a rival lover] let not Phyllida frown; / —But I cannot allow her to smile' (1 (1781): 148–55).

15. Evidence to support the idea that Mrs Collier (and Mary Hays) was personally known to Harrison comes from Harrison's *British Magazine*. In March 1783 appears 'Verses on the Birth-Day of Miss Hays. May 4, 1781. By Mrs. Collier' (2 (1781): 218). I have been unable to find this poem published elsewhere.
16. The poem was later published in the 1796 *Aberdeen Magazine* (143–5), in which it was attributed to 'Miss Scott of Benholm, (Now Mrs Carnegie of Charlestown)', that is, Charleton House, in Montrose. It does not seem to have been widely printed; the letter prefixed to the poem reads 'the following beautiful Poem is now become very scarce'. The attribution is corroborated by Mackie's assertion that the poem emanates 'from the pen of the pious and accomplished Mrs Carnegie of Charlton' (1849: 292). From Mackie we learn 'The date of the original MS. is 1763.' See also Cormack (1966: 34). It is not clear how Harrison found the poem, given that *Lessons in Reading* was published in Aberdeen. Perhaps Scott/Carnegie was helped by James Beattie, with whom she corresponded as Arethusa. Beattie's *Retirement* appears in the same volume of *LPM* as Scott's/Carnegie's poem (1 (1781): 215–8). Alternatively, it could be that Harrison himself read *Lessons in Reading*; the title page states it was 'sold' by 'J. Bew, No. 28, Paternoster Row, London', the Harrisons were based at No. 8 Paternoster Row.
17. Authorship disputed: see Grundy (1999: 104–7).
18. Compare Griffin (1995: 105–6).
19. Tomlins's contribution to *LPM* could well have been her first publication in print. Previously it has been thought that the novel *Conquests of the Heart* (1785) was her debut in print (see *ODNB*). Both poems, renamed, were later reprinted in *Tributes of Affection* (1797): 'Connal', attributed to 'S. 1782' (103–5); and 'Mary', attributed to 'S. 1783' (106–8).

Works Cited

The Aberdeen Magazine; Or, Universal Repository 1796–8. Aberdeen.

Addison, Joseph and Richard Steele. 1965. *The Spectator*. Ed. Donald F. Bond. 5 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Ashfield, Andrew, ed. 1997–8. *Romantic Women Poets*. Rev. 2nd edn. 2 vols. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Austen, Jane. 2003. *Northanger Abbey, Lady Susan, The Watsons, Sanditon*. Ed. James Kinsley and John Davie. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

—. 2004. *Pride and Prejudice*. Ed. James Kinsley. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Benedict, Barbara M. 1996. *Making the Modern Reader: Cultural Mediation in Early Modern Literary Anthologies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bonnell, Thomas. 2008. *The Most Disreputable Trade: Publishing the Classics of English Poetry 1765–1810*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Boswell, James. 1980. *Life of Johnson*. Ed. R. W. Chapman. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Burney, Frances. 1832. *Memoirs of Doctor Burney: Arranged from his Own Manuscripts, from Family Papers, and from Personal Recollections*. 3 vols. London: Edward Moxon.

—. 1889. *The Early Diary of Frances Burney, 1768–1778*. Ed. Annie Raine Ellis. 2 vols. London: G. Bell & Sons.

Campbell Orr, Clarissa. 2002. 'Queen Charlotte: Scientific Queen'. *Queenship in Britain, 1660-1837: Royal Patronage, Court Culture and Dynastic Politics*. Ed. Clarissa Campbell Orr. Manchester: Manchester University Press. 236–66.

Collection of the Best Modern Poems. 1771. London: n. pub.

Cormack, Alexander Allan. 1966. *Susan Carnegie, 1744–1821: Her Life of Service*. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press.

Cowper/Madan, Judith. 'Commonplace Book'. Bodleian Library. MS.Eng.misc.d.636.

Crane, R. S., and F. B. Kaye. 1979. *A Census of British Newspapers and Periodicals, 1620–1800*. London: Holland Press.

Creech, William, ed. 1773–6. *The British Poets*. 44 vols. Edinburgh: A. Kincaid and W. Creech, and J. Balfour.

Curll, Edmund, ed. 1718. *Ladies Miscellany. Consisting of Original Poems, by the Most Eminent Hands … To which are added, Court-Poems, on Several Occasions*. London: E. Curll.

Digital Miscellanies Index. University of Oxford. <http://digitalmiscellaniesindex.org/> (last accessed 16 Dec 2016).

DiPlacidi, Jenny. 29 February 2016: <https://blogs.kent.ac.uk/ladys-magazine/2016/02/29/searching-for-r-a-collaborative-identification/> (last accessed 16 Dec 2016).

Dodsley, Robert, ed. 1748. *A Collection of Poems in Three Volumes, By Several Hands*. 3 vols. London: J. Hughs for R. Dodsley.

Ellis, Markman. 1996. *The Politics of Sensibility: Race, Gender and Commerce in the Sentimental Novel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Elphinston, James, ed. 1764. *A Collection of Poems, From the Best Authors*. London: James Bettenham.

Ezell, Margaret. 1993. *Writing Women's Literary History*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Fara, Patricia. 2002. 'Elizabeth Tollet: A New Newtonian Woman'. *History of Science* 40.2: 169–87.

Fielding, Sarah. 1744. *The Adventures of David Simple*. 2 vols. London: A. Millar.

Fordyce, James. 1766. *Sermons to Young Women*. 2 vols. London: A. Millar and T. Cadell, J. Dodsley, and J. Payne.

Forster, Antonia, ed. 1990. *Index to Book Reviews in England, 1749–1774*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Gamer, Michael. 2008. 'Select Collection: Barbauld, Scott, and the Rise of the (Reprinted) Novel'. *Recognizing the Romantic Novel: New Histories of British Fiction, 1780–1830*. Ed. Jillian Heydt-Stevenson and Charlotte Sussman. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press. 155–91.

Goldsmith, Oliver, ed. 1767. *Poems for Young Ladies. In Three Parts. Devotional, Moral, and Entertaining. The Whole Being a Collection of the Best Pieces in Our Language*. London: J. Payne.

Griffi n, Robert. 1995. *Wordsworth's Pope: A Study in Literary Historiography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grundy, Isobel. 1999. *Lady Mary Wortley Montagu: Comet of the Enlightenment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

—. 2006. 'Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, Six Town Eclogues and Other Poems'. *A Companion to Eighteenth-Century Poetry*. Ed. Christine Gerrard. Oxford: Blackwell. 184–96.

Hansen, Mascha. 2013. '*Scientifick Wives* – Eighteenth-Century Women Between Self, Society and Science'. *Discovering the Human: Life Science and the Arts in the Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries*. Ed. Ralf Haekel and Sabine Blackmore. Göttingen: V&R Unipress. 53–68.

Harrison, Guy. 1950. *Harrison: A Family Imprint*. London: Harrison & Sons.

Harrison, James, ed. 1780–8. *The Novelist's Magazine*. London.

—. 1781–2; 91. *The Lady's Poetical Magazine; Or, Beauties of British Poetry*. London.

—. 1782–3. *The British Magazine and Review; Or, Universal Miscellany of Arts, Sciences, Literature, History, Biography, Entertainment, Poetry, Politics, Manners, Amusements, and Intelligence Foreign and Domestick*. London.

—. 1785–7. *Harrison's British Classicks*.

—. 1795–6? *The Lady's Pocket Magazine; Or, Elegant and Entertaining Companion for the Fair Sex*. London.

Hays, Mary. 1793. *Letters and Essays, Moral, and Miscellaneous*. London: T. Knott.

—. 1798. *Appeal to the Men of Great Britain in Behalf of Women*. London: J. Johnson and J. Bell.

Hodgson, John. 1991. '"Was It for This …?": Wordsworth's Virgilian Questionings'. *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 33.2: 125–36.

Hooke, Robert. 1665. *Micrographia; Or, Some Physiological Descriptions of Minute Bodies Made by Magnifying Glasses: With Observations and Inquiries Thereupon*. London: Jo. Martyn and Ja. Allestry.

Ingram, Allan. 2011. *Melancholy Experience in Literature of the Long Eighteenth Century: Before Depression, 1660–1800*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Johnson, Samuel. [1799–81] 2006. *The Lives of the Most Eminent English Poets; with Critical Observations on their Works*. Ed. Roger Lonsdale. 4 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Jones, Vivien, ed. 1990. *Women in the Eighteenth Century: Constructions of Femininity*. London: Routledge.

Keats, John. 1978. *The Poems of John Keats*. Ed. Jack Stillinger. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

The Ladies Magazine: Or, The Universal Entertainer. 1749–53. London.

The Lady's Magazine; Or, Polite Companion for the Fair Sex. 1759–63. London.

The Lady's Magazine; Or, Entertaining Companion for the Fair Sex, Appropriated Solely to Their Use and Amusement. 1770–1832. London.

Lavoie, Chantel. 1999. '*Poems by Eminent Ladies*: A Study of an Eighteenth-Century Anthology'. PhD thesis, University of Toronto.

—. 2009. *Collecting Women: Poetry and Lives, 1700–1780*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press.

Lessons in Reading; or, Miscellaneous Pieces in Prose and Verse, Selected from the Best English Authors. 1780. Aberdeen: Joseph Taylor.

The London Chronicle. 1757–1800. London.

Lonsdale, Roger, ed. 1989. *Eighteenth Century Women Poets: An Oxford Anthology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McGann, Jerome. 1996. *The Poetics of Sensibility: A Revolution in Literary Style*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Mackie, Charles. 1849. *The Castles, Palaces and Prisons of Mary of Scotland*. London: C. Cox. *Monthly Review*. 1759–89. London.

More, Hannah. 1782. *Sacred Dramas: Chiefly Intended for Young Persons: The Subjects taken from the Bible. To which is added, Sensibility, A Poem*. London: T. Cadell.

Poems by Eminent Ladies. 1755. Ed. George Colman and Bonnell Thornton. 2 vols. London: R. Baldwin.

Poems by the Most Eminent Ladies of Great-Britain and Ireland ... Selected, with an Account of the Writers, by G. Colman and B. Thornton, Esqrs. A New Edition. 1773. 2 vols. London: T. Becket & Co. and T. Evans.

Poems by the Most Eminent Ladies of Great Britain and Ireland. Re-Published from the Collection of G. Colman and B. Thornton. With Considerable Alterations, Additions, and Improvements. c.1785. 2 vols. London: W. Stafford.

Pope, Alexander. 1961–9. *Twickenham Edition of the Poems of Alexander Pope*. Ed. John Butt et al. 11 vols. London: Methuen.

Ready, Kathryn. 2004. '"What then, Poor Beastie!": Gender, Politics, and Animal Experimentation in Anna Barbauld's *The Mouse's Petition*'. *Eighteenth-Century Life* 28.1: 92–114.

Rees, Thomas. 1896. *Reminiscences of Literary London, from 1779 to 1853. With Interesting Anecdotes of Publishers, Authors and Book Auctioneers of that Period, &c. &c. With Extensive Additions by John Britton. Edited by a Book Lover*. London: Suckling & Galloway.

Rizzo, Betty. 1994. *Companions Without Vows: Relationships Among Eighteenth-Century British Women*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Rose, Mark. 1993. *Authors and Owners: The Invention of Copyright*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Saunders, David. 1992. *Authorship and Copyright*. London: Routledge.

Scott, Mary. 1984. *The Female Advocate: A Poem: Occasioned by Reading Mr. Duncombe's*

Feminead. (1774). Ed. Gae Holladay. UCLA, LA: William Andrews Clark Memorial Library. Shevelow, Kathryn. 1989. *Women and Print Culture: The Construction of Femininity in the*

Early Periodical. London and New York: Routledge.

Shiells, Robert. 1753. *The Lives of the Poets of Great Britain and Ireland, to the Time of Dean Swift. Compiled from Ample Materials Scattered in a Variety of Books*. 5 vols. London: R. Griffiths.

Steele, Richard. 1987. *The Tatler*. Ed. Donald F. Bond. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Suarez, Michael. 2001. 'The Production and Consumption of the Eighteenth-Century Poetic Miscellany'. *Books and their Readers in Eighteenth-Century England: New Essays*. Ed. Isabel Rivers. Leicester: Leicester University Press. 217–51.

Taylor, Richard. 1993. 'James Harrison, *The Novelist's Magazine*, and the Early Canonising of the English Novel'. *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900* 33.3: 629–43.

Todd, Janet. 1986. *Sensibility: An Introduction*. London: Methuen.

Tomlins, Elizabeth Sophia. 1785. *The Conquests of the Heart*. Dublin: Price, S. Watson, Moncrieffe, Jenkin, Walker, Burton, Burnet, White, Byrne, H. Whitestone, Parker, Marchbank, Colbert, and W. Porter.

Tomlins, Elizabeth Sophia, and Thomas Tomlins. 1797. *Tributes of Affection: with The Slave; and Other Poems. By a Lady; and Her Brother*. London: H. and C. Baldwin.

Trapp, Joseph, trans. 1731. *The Works of Virgil: Translated into English Blank Verse. With Large Explanatory Notes, and Critical Observations*. 3 vols. London. J. Brotherton, J. Hazard, W. Meadows, T. Cox, W. Hinchliffe.

Walker, Gina Luria, ed. 2006. *The Idea of Being Free: A Mary Hays Reader*. Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press.

Wollstonecraft, Mary. 1995. *A Vindication of the Rights of Men; with A Vindication of the Rights of Woman, and Hints*. Ed. Sylvana Tomaselli. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Woodmansee, Martha, and Peter Jaszi. 1994. *The Construction of Authorship: Textual Appropriation in Law and Literature*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Wordsworth, William. 1977. *The Prelude, 1798–1799*. Ed. Stephen Parrish. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.