

This podcast transcript was created for accessibility purposes using an automated transcription service. It has been reviewed for general accuracy but may contain minor discrepancies. It should not be considered a definitive record of the conversation. If you have any questions, please contact us at podcast@masshist.org.

A Miniature Portrait of Elizabeth Freeman

Anne Bentley 00:03

Her hair is white. You've got these lovely, little, tiny white curls under a white mob cap that ties under her chin. You can just see the gold beads around her neck. And then she's wearing a plain dress of the period, which is blue. And she is seated facing the left, but her eyes are skewed over looking at the viewer. I've often wondered if she actually sat for that because only people of means and leisure could afford to sit still and pay for a portrait.

Katy Morris 00:35

[Intro music fades in] This is Katy Morris.

Kanisorn Wongsrichanalai 00:40

This is Kanisorn Wongsrichanalai.

Katy Morris 00:42

And this is The Object of History, a podcast by the Massachusetts Historical Society.

Kanisorn Wongsrichanalai 00:48

Since 1791, the MHS has sought to collect, preserve and communicate the building blocks of history.

Katy Morris 00:54

Each episode examines an object, document or set of items from the society's millions of manuscript pieces and artifacts. We take you on a behind the scenes tour of our stacks to explore the incredible stories held within our collections. In this episode, we're looking at the story of Elizabeth Freeman, a woman born into slavery in the 18th century, who successfully sued for her freedom and helped bring about the end of slavery in Massachusetts.

Kanisorn Wongsrichanalai 01:21

Following her suit, Freeman took up paid work within the household of her lawyer Theodore Sedgwick. For the rest of her long life, Freeman maintained a close and complicated relationship with the Sedgwick's. In this episode, you will hear from Stephen T. Riley Librarian, Peter Drummey.

Peter Drummey 01:40

We're left to try to figure out how much of that motivation came from discussion of natural rights.

Kanisorn Wongsrichanalai 01:48

Historian Felicia Thomas.

Felicia Thomas 01:51

Elizabeth Freeman's case makes me have to rethink the intellectual work of slavery.

Kanisorn Wongsrichanalai 01:57

And MHS Curator of Art and Artifacts, Anne Bentley.

Anne Bentley 02:00

We really don't know even when she was born. They think around 1744.

Kanisorn Wongsrichanalai 02:07

Together, we shall learn about slavery in rural New England, Elizabeth's pivotal freedom suit and how her story came to the MHS through the Sedgwick family records. We shall also take a close look at a miniature portrait of Elizabeth, as well as a bracelet of gold beads that once belonged to her.

Katy Morris 02:28

Before we get started, a quick note to listeners. Elizabeth was known for much of her life as Mumbet before taking the name Elizabeth Freeman after her successful suit. You will hear us refer to her by both names reflecting the name many called her throughout her life and her chosen name.

Kanisorn Wongsrichanalai 02:45

Now to the story. To understand Elizabeth's life, we first asked Professor Thomas and Peter Drummey to help us understand the world of slavery in Massachusetts.

Felicia Thomas 02:57

Slavery, as a sort of practice at in institution, is really as American as apple pie. We think of it as very regionalized, a plantation society in the deep south. But that is a history that actually comes a bit later. In this earlier history, slavery is being practiced in Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, as well as in Virginia, South Carolina. So, when I think about the history of slavery in New England, I try to address the many people for years would say, 'Well, slavery in New England was never that important. There weren't that many slaves. The slaves who lived there experienced a kinder, gentler form of slavery,' whatever that is, right? And you could say, well, yes, maybe each household only had a small number of slaves, and not every household was slave holding. But you could say the same thing about a place like Mississippi in the 1830s and while there come to be some bigger holdings and plantations, those are often the exception, not the rule. The significance of this, though, in a place like Massachusetts, is that it means particular challenges for enslaved people to form communities with other people of color, because, you know, the holdings would be so disparate. Where are you going to find a partner? Will there be possibilities for family life?

Peter Drummey 04:24

So, if you think, in the case of Elizabeth Freeman living in a household in Sheffield, Massachusetts, she's living in a town that, before the revolution, has a population of about 1000 the largest town in Berkshire County, but has about 25 black people living there in 1765 and in 1771 of subset of those people are described as being servants for life, enslaved. So, you have slavery at on a small scale,

essentially everywhere in Massachusetts, with larger numbers of black people living in the seaports and in large towns, but something on a small scale across the entire colony. And this is a farming landscape. So, this is a slavery that may not be familiar to people, that is slaves living within an extended household. So, that in the case of someone like Mumbet, as Elizabeth Freeman was known for most of her life. She's doing a variety of domestic duties.

Felicia Thomas 05:27

Enslaved women are doing all sorts of things. They are working, in some cases, in homes, in towns, and working, as let's say, body servants for their owners, where they're helping, let's say, with grooming, with dressing, with a variety of household tasks, from cleaning to cooking. If there is a plot of land, then they may be gardening. They may be doing animal husbandry. On rural farms, they may also be doing what we would think of as more heavy agricultural labor, you know, plowing and seeding and harvesting. They are spinning. They are weaving. And often the most highly valued enslaved people going to be people who can switch back and forth, who are able to do whatever is necessary.

Kanisorn Wongsrichanalai 06:20

As we learned about Elizabeth's world, we wanted to know more specific details about her life. What traces of Elizabeth's experiences have been preserved in the archive?

Peter Drummey 06:31

Elizabeth Freeman was living in the household of Colonel John Ashley, a substantial figure who would have household servants. She's come to that household through the marriage of Ashley's wife, Hannah Hogeboom, who's come from upstate New York and has brought as part of her inheritance enslaved people with her, including, as far as we can tell, Mumbet (Elizabeth Freeman) and there are records from the Hogebooms living south of Albany in upstate New York. So, you have some information there. But this becomes very difficult, and Mumbet is living in the Ashley household with another young black woman, and it's not clear whether that's Mumbet's sister or her daughter. That's how little information we have about her life. We know later on in her life, she

has an identifiable daughter, but we don't know if that daughter's already been born and is growing up in the Ashley household at that time.

Anne Bentley 07:33

We really don't know even when she was born. They think around 1744, and for most black women in the 18th and early 19th century, when we do get their stories, it comes to us through a white narrator of the time. So, we're lucky to have their names, if at all. We're luckier to have their story, even in part. Mumbet's story comes to us through Catherine Maria Sedgwick. And the things that come through to us from Catherine Maria are mostly stories that document the Sedgwick's love for this woman because essentially, she was their mother as they were growing up. Their mother, Pamela, had deep depression most of her life, and it was Elizabeth Freeman who cared for her, cared for her children. So, her telling of the story of the woman she called Mumbet is sort of proprietary, and it's through her lens that we know of Elizabeth Freeman. She admired her, she loved her, she clearly respected her, but it's always through the lens of white paternalism, and we'll never know there are so many unknowns because Elizabeth Freeman did not write or read. Her voice is silenced, except in the few areas where somebody has perhaps paraphrased her in quoting but has tried to give some semblance of who she was.

Felicia Thomas 09:17

How do we write about people who don't leave the kinds of traces in the archive. So, I'm both looking at what is said, but I'm also trying to interpret silences, because sometimes those say as much as the actual documents say. I also try to be very intentional about where it is that I am speculating and on what grounds because historians speculate all the time. We can't time travel. I'm always astonished that as historians, we assume that certain people's words don't require any sort of mediation or unpacking, right? They say what they mean. They mean what they say. What records are there that aren't mediated by some perspective and so on and so forth, as though, for instance, sources about a prominent person like Theodore Sedgwick are not mediated. It's easy for us to lose sight of that, as though there is some perfectly objective way that we can get to the inner most workings of anyone, right? Why are we so surprised about that when it comes to enslaved people is

my question. So, I keep this in my mind. I try to think about the ways that any time a source is mediated, the preoccupations of the mediator are going to be kind of implicit in the source, asking whether or not I think Catherine Maria Sedgwick is a sort of reliable documenter, and I can't go back and ask her, so I'm just going to move forward to sort of say, but what can she tell me, even with all of these concerns and limitations, and shall I ignore what she can tell me because I have these issues or questions or concerns, I don't think so.

Anne Bentley 11:08

The stories where she actually quotes Elizabeth Freeman, her words have the most impact for me and one particular quote that she gives...

Katy Morris 11:22

Yes, please share it with us.

Anne Bentley 11:23

According to Catherine Maria, she says, 'Mumbet's character was composed of few and strong elements.' Very interesting, only few? We continue. 'Action was the law of her nature, as it is of all superior natures and conscious of superiority to all around her, a state of servitude was intolerable.' She says it was not the work. 'Work was play to her. Her power of execution was marvelous, nor was it awe of her kind master, or fear of her despotic mistress, but it was the galling of the harness, the irrepressible longing for liberty. I have often heard her say with an emphatic shake of the head, peculiar to her any time while I was a slave, if one minute's freedom had been offered to me, and I had been told I must die at the end of that minute, I would have taken it just to stand one minute on God's earth a free woman.'

Katy Morris 12:40

So, how did Elizabeth go from dreaming of freedom to demanding it in court? Peter helped us understand how Elizabeth successfully leveraged her circumstances.

Peter Drummey 12:51

There are several different threads of this. Catherine Maria Sedgwick says that Mumbet heard the Declaration of Independence read with this statement that all men are free and equal, and that is her motivation to go to Theodore Sedgwick. Her hearing the Declaration of Independence read is logical along one line. The revolutionary government of Massachusetts had the declaration reprinted and circulated to all the parishes within Massachusetts, and then it was to be read by the minister at the end of services. So, literally, almost everyone in Massachusetts would have heard the Declaration of Independence read. It's much more likely that there are other threads to pull here as well. One is the Sheffield resolves and the agitation leading up to the revolution. In 1773 the town of Sheffield compiled a list of complaints against royal authority. These were compiled at Colonel Ashley's house, and much closer to the date of Mumbet's petition, you have the Massachusetts Constitution of 1780 with strong protection of personal liberty, a Charter of Rights embedded right in the Constitution, which again have these same statements about freedom and equality, and all these things are at work. So, we're left to try to figure out how much of that motivation came from discussion of natural rights and individual rights that was in the air at the time of the revolution was this eight years after hearing the Sheffield resolves. Was it five years after hearing the Declaration of Independence, or was it in the year following the adoption of the Massachusetts Constitution that Elizabeth Freeman moved forward? It's also the case that there's another part of the story that Catherine Maria Sedgwick passes down that's more personal.

Anne Bentley 15:03

One of the sparks that led her to sue for her freedom and to leave the Ashley household was that at some point while living with them, Hannah Ashley was very, very cruel to the enslaved servants in her household, so much so that Mumbet Elizabeth Freeman had a major scar on her arm where she had interfered between Mrs. Ashley, who had taken a hot shovel from the ashes and was planning to beat a child with it. We suspect that the child was Elizabeth's own daughter. Elizabeth put her arm out and received a gash down to the bone, and this is one of the stories that Catherine tells about her character. Elizabeth did not cover this wound while it was healing, and to anyone

who asked her about it in the mistress's presence, she would say, 'Ask the Mistress.' She wouldn't answer how she got it. She would just say, 'Ask the mistress.'

Felicia Thomas 16:08

Well, that's bold, you know, oh my goodness, the interior landscape in this scene of what's going on between, you know, Freeman, her kin, her mistress, the others, who's asking her, how'd you get that scar? Who is it that doesn't know? So much to interrogate. But I am really struck by the ways that what Elizabeth Freeman reports about this brutality is that she uses it to sort of chastise, call out her mistress. And while we cannot say for sure. We can speculate that nothing like this ever happens again. She uses this experience of violence, right, as a sort of springboard for her own autonomy and emancipation.

Katy Morris 16:58

Surrounded by a constant rhetoric of rights, while also enduring the horrific violence of enslavement, Elizabeth decided to sue for her freedom. The first hurdle was to convince an influential young lawyer to take her case.

Kanisorn Wongsrichanalai 17:13

And why does Theodore Sedgwick take the case?

Peter Drummey 17:16

Theodore Sedgwick is a young lawyer living in Sheffield, but at the beginning of his both his legal career and his public career, the recollection that's been passed down to us is that he so admired this person who came to her, who was so forthright and strong in her own character, that he took her on as a client along those lines of just admiring her forthright attempt to secure her own freedom.

Kanisorn Wongsrichanalai 17:44

Is he himself a slaveholder?

Peter Drummey 17:47

Well, that's what, what makes this whole story complicated and then complicated again, that he owns slaves before he undertakes this case in 1781 to aid in someone in securing their freedom, and really in following Theodore Sedgwick's long public career, there's always this sort of balance of it on political lines. Theodore Sedgwick is deeply politically conservative at the same time, he both belongs to abolition societies and then as a member of Congress, he defends the first Fugitive Slave Act in 1790 so this is a tension within his life. Sedgwick is someone who appears to be proud of this role he played in ending slavery in Massachusetts, but he on the national level, is perfectly prepared to accept that people elsewhere have property rights that include people that there is a right to demand the return of fugitive slaves. So, all these things are going on at the same time.

Kanisorn Wongsrichanalai 18:54

Well, let's get to the trial.

Peter Drummey 18:56

Well, this is the 18th century, so the trial begins on the 21st of August in 1781 and the jury comes to a decision the next day. One of the things that's interesting about this case and many, many things interesting about it, but one of the interesting things is John Ashley is a judge in Berkshire County, so he doesn't sit on the case that involves his own human property, suing for their freedom. But he has to remove himself from supervising the specific case and the case of Mumbet has been joined with the case of another enslaved person, a man named Brom, agricultural laborer together. So, the case is actually Brom and Bett versus John Ashley.

Kanisorn Wongsrichanalai 19:47

And is Brom also owned by John Ashley?

Peter Drummey 19:50

Yes, they're suing John Ashley for holding them illegally. Freedom suits, that is individual enslaved people suing for their own freedom were not uncommon, but they were almost always to do with contractual matters. Someone had been promised their freedom for some service or for some monetary value, but Mumbet is suing for her freedom as the story is told, because of constitutional rights. It's also the case that to make a suit at this county court, there had to be a property value of a substantial amount to bring a case before the court. So probably by combining two cases together, Theodore Sedgwick met that threshold of the value of loss to Brom and Bett together, rather than one or the other. There may also have been some concern about representing a woman who would have in the 18th century and on thereafter, have more limited latitude to make a suit on her own behalf. Mumbet is described as a spinster in the suit. That is that she is not married or dependent as a chattel if she's, in fact, free, as she claims to be.

Felicia Thomas 21:08

Elizabeth Freeman's case makes me have to rethink intellectual work of slavery, mostly because she, as far as we know, is not literate, but that doesn't keep her from deciphering really important, critical information and analyzing it for her own benefit, right? As far as we know from the sources, it is not that someone else puts her up to suing for her freedom. She actually is engaging with these revolutionary ideas around liberty, around equality, and maybe she cannot read or write it, but she can certainly think it, think it well enough to convince someone to take on her case, and think it well enough to argue, if all men are free in this new state of Massachusetts, am I some dumb critter, right? Elizabeth Freeman makes us think about the limits of literacy, or illiteracy, if you will, to think about different ways of reasoning, different arguments to be mounted in different ways, the use of persuasion, all of these things and her her suit. You know, both her, her persistence, her ability to bring many prominent people to her side and to her aid, not the least of which is Theodore Sedgwick. She, she clearly is a person even enslaved, who has a certain stature in the community who is well thought of, who has wide ranging relationships with lots of different kinds of people, who is sophisticated enough socially to kind of leverage that for her own good.

Peter Drummey 22:55

This is relatively brief and straightforward. Persuades the jury. It's tried before a panel of justices, and it's but it's a jury trial, and they find for Brom and Bett, and John Ashley is to pay, not just an amount to the two of them, 30 shillings, but he's also has to pay the court costs for the suit. The case within Massachusetts gets combined with an other suit from two years later in 1783 and those cases together, it's not that on August 22nd 1781, slavery ends in Massachusetts. It's a blow to it, and it's hard to see thereafter how people won't be able to sue for freedom and prevail. The actual lawsuit only affects Brom and Bett, but I think it's very clear that their victory in their suit, and also other successful suits for freedom, means that over a very short period of years, the 1000s of enslaved people in Massachusetts become free and slavery can no longer stand here. By the federal census of 1790 no one is recorded as being enslaved in Massachusetts.

Kanisorn Wongsrichanalai 24:23

So, what happens to Brom? What happens to Mumbet after the trial?

Peter Drummey 24:28

We know less about Brom than we do about Mumbet, because Mumbet spending most of the rest of her long life in the household of the Sedgwick's. We have a better idea of what her life looked like and know more about it. And in her case, the really important issue almost immediately that comes up is her renaming herself.

Felicia Thomas 24:54

I think the fact that she names herself Elizabeth Freeman tells us so much about what she thinks about freedom that she is known as Mumbet. She continues to be known as Mumbet, Betty, but she names herself when she's a free woman. My legal my formal identity is Freeman. I think that it is not speculating too much to say that freedom is incredibly important in her own sort of self, understanding her sense of identity. I think it's significant to her to understand herself as part of a body politic in Massachusetts that leveling a suit, going to court and actually prevailing means that you're officially a part of a system in a way that as an enslaved person just isn't possible. I also, you

know, when I, when I look at the evidence we have from her life, there are some ways that freedom is not you know, the kind of work that she's doing is not so different from the work that she would have done in slavery, although in freedom, she would be remunerated for it, and that is not insignificant. She may have some more options about for whom and under what conditions she might work. There will be limits to that, of course.

Anne Bentley 26:18

Gaining her freedom, winning her freedom was not the end of it for her, for the rest of her life, even though she's free and she's a paid servant, like any other free servant, how free is she? As a member of a minority in Stockbridge, Massachusetts, life was precarious, and all of this brings me to the bracelet.

Katy Morris 26:41

Yes, please tell me the story of the bracelet.

Anne Bentley 26:43

Well, apparently Catherine Maria Sedgwick, at some point, gifted to Elizabeth Freeman, Mumbet a necklace of gold beads, and she's wearing this necklace in her miniature portrait. And on December 31st 1884, a gentleman by the name of William Minot gave to the Massachusetts Historical Society a bracelet made of gold beads. These are the beads from Elizabeth Freeman, Mumbets necklace. And in the letter that he sent with the bracelet, he wrote "She [Mumbet] was in the habit of wearing a necklace of gold beads, and just before her death, she gave this necklace to Miss Catherine Maria Sedgwick, the youngest daughter of Judge Sedgwick and her biographer. Miss Sedgwick valued it highly and had the beads formed into a bracelet as more convenient for her own wear. At her death, she gave the bracelet to her niece, my wife, who, in turn, left it to my daughter, lately deceased." They're hollow beads, very small. They aren't, I don't think they're even a quarter inch in diameter. They're very small. And as they came to us, they are a double strand linked chains, and there are, let's see, there are seven beads in each chain, and they are separated by three gold links. And there is a circa 1840s square clasp that has really pretty Florentine engraving on it.

Katy Morris 28:21

It's so beautiful.

Anne Bentley 28:23

Isn't it? It's very pretty.

Katy Morris 28:25

Are the beads faceted? They almost look like they are, or they are they round?

Anne Bentley 28:30

No, because, because they're hollow, and because they were worn for so long on her wrist, they're, they're all dented.

Katy Morris 28:37

Oh, that's what I'm seeing. Yes, because they don't look like smooth spheres.

Anne Bentley 28:41

Yeah, they aren't smooth. No, they're just that they're dented and kind of pockmarked. There's, there's not a round one in the bunch.

Katy Morris 28:47

But that's from where that's sort of lovely.

Anne Bentley 28:49

Yes, they said she wore Catherine Mariah wore it for the rest of her life, and and it the knicks and the dings bear that out. So that's how we got the bracelet. However, complicating the issue, Mumbet made a will, and in her will, she said, "To my great granddaughter Lydia Maria Ann Van Schaach, I give my gold beads." The puzzle is, did she forget that she left the beads to her great

granddaughter and returned them to the donor, Catherine Maria Sedgwick or did Charles Sedgwick ignore that provision in her will because Catherine wanted a keepsake and they felt the beads should go back to her. What happened?

Katy Morris 29:40

All we know is, at some point she intended to bequeath it to her own family, and that that is not what happened.

Anne Bentley 29:48

Exactly. On the one hand, it's hard to think of the Sedgwick's who revered this woman not obeying her final wishes. But on the other hand, her great granddaughter didn't get the necklace.

Katy Morris 30:02

Right? I also wonder if the Sedgwick's sort of felt that it really was theirs.

Anne Bentley 30:08

It's just it's a mystery we will never know. And when she died, we're not sure whose idea it was, but the children decided to bury her in the Sedgwick family plot. What did her own family think about this? Did they have a say in this? Did she want to be buried there with the with the Sedgwick's? Did she? Did she? You know, it's just it, just there. We will never know, and we have the names of her, her child and her grandchildren. We were trying to find any death records, any burial records, any any wills, any anything, and we find nothing in the records.

Katy Morris 30:51

Yeah, so they, they almost, it's like Elizabeth comes to us through history, through the Sedgwick's, but her own family, her own descendants, don't make it into the archive.

Anne Bentley 31:02

She had a whole family.

Katy Morris 31:10

Should we turn to the painting?

Anne Bentley 31:12

To the portrait, yes. This is a miniature, which is watercolor on ivory, and her hair is white. You've got these lovely, little, tiny white curls under a white mob cap that ties under her chin. You can just see the gold beads around her neck, her bare neck. And then she's wearing a plain dress of the of the period, which is blue. It's it's aquamarine blue, a little bit paler than that. And she is seated facing the sitter's left, but her eyes are skewed over, looking at the viewer.

Katy Morris 31:50

Yes, she's looking right at you.

Anne Bentley 31:52

Yes, it's a very I've often wondered if she actually sat for that. I think she may have, because by that point, 1811 she's retired. She's a woman of leisure at that point, after working her whole life. Only people of means and leisure could afford to sit still and pay for a portrait, which is why there are so few portraits of people of color in our colonial period. And it was painted by Susan Anne Livingston Ridley Sedgwick, the wife of Theodore Sedgwick Jr. So, the painter's husband was one of Mumbet's charges, and I've often wondered if this wasn't a gift painted for her husband, for whom Elizabeth Freeman was Mumbet. But it's clearly painted because this woman had such pride of place in these children's lives and it's, it's a very small thing in its frame it's, you know, maybe three and a half by six inches, if that.

Katy Morris 32:58

So tiny. I have so many questions about this painting, but one of the most striking things when you first see it also is the frame. Do we know is that its original frame?

Anne Bentley 33:11

That is its original frame, it is of the period, and that's another, another reason that I think it was possibly painted for her husband, because it's a very fancy frame. It's hand carved quite intricate wooden frame, and it's just gilt solid gold leaf all around. It's sort of enshrining Mother Bett.

Katy Morris 33:34

Yes, and echoing the gold beads around her neck, because the frame almost has a beaded look to it as well.

Anne Bentley 33:41

Yes. Yeah, it was meant for for somebody important. And somebody important to Susan Ann would have been her husband, who obviously cherished Mumbet.

Katy Morris 33:50

So, when you look at this portrait, what does it tell you about Elizabeth?

Anne Bentley 33:56

Well, it tells me that she was very fashionable, but you look at that lovely little ruffle around her face with her bonnet, that's not a utilitarian bonnet, that's her best bonnet. And she's wearing her necklace. She had other jewelry. She liked finery, and she had it, and she had to do give to her daughter and granddaughters in her will. But you can see a you know, you bring what you want into looking at a portrait like this. And I see here an older woman who's earned her rest. By golly, she's earned her rest to sit for a portrait.

Katy Morris 34:36

Yes, I like that and she's earned her fancy dress.

Anne Bentley 34:40

Nobody's, nobody's hands, but hers provided her livelihood.

Katy Morris 34:54

What do you wish you knew about Elizabeth Freeman, if you could time travel and go talk to her?
What do you wish you knew?

Felicia Thomas 35:04

I would like to know where she took pride in her own effort because any of us who work, there's the work we do because it is required, but there's also the work that we find meaning in and we take pride in. I wonder what she thought about that. I wish she'd kept a diary. I wish that we had a recording. What did her voice sound like? Did she have a Dutch accent? Perhaps I would love to ask her what she thought about Massachusetts after the end of the American Revolution and the enactment of the state constitution. What aspirations and hopes did she have for this place where she lived and where she worked?

Peter Drummey 35:45

What I wish I could know about Elizabeth Freeman is how she saw her relationship with the Sedgwicks. That is what that looked like from the other side of that they celebrate her and even in some respects, worship her. But was that a matter of her basking in that affection and appreciation or was this a matter of burden to her. Without any documents in her own voice or any recollection passed down apart from this family that she had such a long and complicated connection with. It would just be wonderful to have something independent of that, and especially to have something that would tell us about how she saw her circumstance.

Anne Bentley 36:35

I just wish we knew more about her from her, because there are so many gaps, we tend to fill in the gaps with our own point of view. It's all guesswork and presumption. But that doesn't satisfy me. I would rather know her through her her own words and her own actions. And you multiply that by the hundreds of 1000s of women of this period, you know, to go through slavery like that, and to want more for yourself and your children, and to work to make it happen. And so rarely was

someone in a place and a time where they could make something like this happen. Yeah, it's just so many stories we'll never know.

Katy Morris 37:19

To view the objects in the episode and to learn more, visit our website at www.masshist.org/podcast. You can also email us your questions and comments to podcast@Masshist.org. We would love to hear from you. If you enjoyed the show, help us spread the word and share the podcast with your friends. Stay up to date with our latest episodes by subscribing on iTunes, Stitcher, or wherever you listen to your podcasts. The Object of History is produced by the research department at the Massachusetts Historical Society. We want to thank Anne Bentley, our Curator of Art and Artifacts, Peter Drummey, Chief Historian and Stephen T. Riley Librarian, and assistant professor, Felicia Thomas of Morgan State University. Music in this episode is by Dominic Giam of Ketsa Music and by Podington Bear. See our show notes for details. Thanks for listening.