

“Slavery” and “To Mrs. Eliot on the Death of Her Child”

Two New Manuscript Poems Connected
to Phillis Wheatley by the Bostonian Poet
Ruth Barrell Andrews

A commonplace book containing two previously unknown poems connected to Phillis Wheatley is a significant recent discovery that sheds fresh light on Wheatley’s reception and participation in the local manuscript culture of Boston. The poems, entitled “Slavery” and “To Mrs. Eliot on the Death of Her Child,” reveal that poetic coteries in Boston, and specific manuscript poets in particular, were more active in Wheatley’s career than has been understood. This essay introduces the lately uncovered poet Ruth Barrell Andrews (1749–1831) and two of her poems that relate directly to Wheatley.

Ruth Barrell Andrews wrote the poem “Slavery” at a crucial junction in Phillis Wheatley’s career: on December 1, 1772, while Wheatley’s manuscript was en route to London. With the encouragement of friends, one of whom might well have been Andrews, the determined Wheatley had just pulled her fledgling subscription drive from the local printer in Boston and set her sights on the more prestigious London press. Just weeks earlier, Wheatley had secured the necessary documentation she needed to ensure her manuscript’s publication in London, which included an attestation to confirm her authorship signed by the elite men of Boston. A flurry of activity to promote the sable muse and secure the Countess of Huntingdon as her patron had already begun, and supporters at home were anxious to see the poems in print. John Andrews, a Boston lawyer and Ruth’s husband, had already expressed impatience earlier that spring with the doomed Boston printing. In a letter to Ruth’s brother, the Philadelphian merchant William Barrell, John complained, “Its above two months since

I subscribed for Phillis's poems, which I expected to have sent you long ago, but the want of Spirit to carry on any thing of the kind here has prevented it, as they are not yet publish'd" (May 29, 1772). In contrast to this "want of Spirit" in her local Bostonians, the well-connected poet Ruth Barrell Andrews was subsequently inspired to promote and to celebrate Wheatley's book, as well as to proclaim the meaning of its imminent publication.

The discovery of Andrews's poem "Slavery" is particularly important because it inverts the story of Wheatley's success that scholars have often told through documents authored by her male supporters. Because the oft-cited correspondence concerning Wheatley's forthcoming volume of poetry took place between two men close to Ruth Barrell Andrews, John Andrews and William Barrell, her own significant role has been overlooked. However, apparently at least one woman in the background of their letters was much more important to the story than has been understood. Following Joanna Brooks's research, which effectively established that Wheatley made her career "not by securing a single endorsement by powerful men, but by cultivating an intricate network of relationships among white women," one might well expect that at least one of these white women who had judged Wheatley's verse favorably and circulated it widely would have publicly claimed some stake in the poet's approaching success (7–8).¹ Andrews's poem "Slavery," which survives in a manuscript volume of her poetry at the Boston Public Library, as well as in a handwritten copy made by her nephew at the Massachusetts Historical Society, seems to have done just that.²

The fact that Andrews authored the poem is no small matter. Though her verse, which seems to have been primarily, if not exclusively, in manuscript, has been unknown to literary scholars until now, it was well known to the upper echelon of Boston, as she was the sister to several successful merchants, including one of the city's wealthiest, Joseph Barrell. More importantly, she descended from a family of esteemed Boston writers. Ruth Barrell Andrews was the daughter of Ruth Green Barrell, a poet in her own right, whose brother, the rum distiller Joseph Green, was the archpoet of the tavern literati and the most celebrated wit of Boston. Ruth Green Barrell, along with her husband, John Barrell, a successful rum merchant, was part of Joseph Green's poetic inner circle.³

Andrews actively participated in the poetic culture of this well-known

family of versifiers. For instance, she bantered with her brother Joseph in verse just as her mother had with her own sibling Joseph Green. At least once, Andrews engaged in a poetic exchange with her famous uncle Green, who praised her work.⁴ She encouraged her favorite niece Fanny, about whom she wrote several poems, when the young girl started writing poetry at an early age (*Poems* 104). Later in life, Andrews drew inspiration from the encouragement of her nephew Theodore Barrell, Jr., also regarded as a talented writer by relatives (Letter to Theodore). The literary culture of the family continued to flourish with many in the next generation of the Barrell family pursuing their literary ambitions, the most famous being Andrews's niece Sally Sayward Barrell Keating Wood, a prolific fiction writer known as Madame Wood, Maine's first novelist.⁵ The subsequent generation included the minister and prolific abolitionist George Barrell Cheever, who published widely, including posthumous poems. Collected papers of the various Barrell family members show continued production of manuscript poetry by women well into the nineteenth century.⁶

Given the family's activity and status in the poetic manuscript culture of Boston, it would be remarkable if they did not take an active interest in Wheatley, especially since Andrews and her family had direct contact with her. Andrews's manuscript volume, which covers the period 1770 to 1788, features a network of friendships and familial relations that place her within close social proximity to the Wheatley family. First, her uncle Green was married at Phillis's Old South Church. In 1771, Rev. John Lathrop, minister of Second Church, officiated at Ruth Barrell's marriage to John Andrews, and he himself married Mary Wheatley, the daughter of Susanna and John Wheatley, and Phillis's unofficial tutor. Perhaps most significantly, after Mary Wheatley's passing, Rev. Lathrop married in 1780 Ruth Barrell Andrews's best friend, Elizabeth Checkley (referred to as Betsy), the granddaughter of Rev. Samuel Checkley, the pastor of Susanna and John Wheatley's congregation. Additionally, Ruth's brother Joseph, who engaged her in belletristic banter, married Hannah Fitch three months after Phillis was baptized—both events officiated by Rev. Samuel Cooper. Hannah's father, Timothy Fitch, owned the ship that brought Phillis to Boston and which had become her namesake. Just this brief survey of the Barrell family confirms multiple points of contact with Wheatley that heretofore had been more speculative.

Additionally, the discovery of Andrews's poetic interest in Wheatley

adds to the current understanding of Wheatley's manuscript circulation. For instance, Brooks has already brought to scholarly attention Andrews's circulation of Wheatley's elegy on Charles Eliot, son of Andrews's sister, Elizabeth Barrell Eliot. But now that Andrews's poetic interest in Wheatley has been shown to be much deeper, it is almost certain that she shared other Wheatley poems with the Eliot family. While it was already known that Andrews was connected to the Belknap family through her sister Elizabeth's marriage to Samuel Eliot, brother of Ruth Eliot, who married Jeremy Belknap, little had been extracted from this connection. Given that it is now certain that Andrews exchanged poetry with her uncle Joseph Green, and given that Andrews's sister Elizabeth Barrell Eliot is the sister-in-law of Ruth Eliot Belknap, Jeremy Belknap's copy of Wheatley's earliest known verse likely came through either Andrews or one of these familial correspondents.⁷

More remarkably, the disclosure of Ruth Barrell Andrews's poetic claim in Wheatley broadens the likely field of Wheatley's poetic mentors. Though scholars often cite Mather Byles as Wheatley's primary literary mentor, Joseph Green, who signed Wheatley's attestation along with Byles, was just as well known in Boston, and more highly regarded for dominating the manuscript scene with his erudition and poetic wit. While Wheatley's published volume clearly shows Byles's influence, Green's impact on Wheatley, especially in manuscript, deserves further attention than it has received thus far, as does the possible effect of Ruth Green Barrell. The paramount implication of Andrews's verse, however, is that until now there has been no written evidence that pointed to a specific young, white woman poet who mentored Wheatley. The fact that Andrews often encouraged other young female poets increases the likelihood that she took an active interest in Wheatley. This discovery will not only help scholars explore a larger breadth of Wheatley's poetic world but also help clarify how Wheatley negotiated some of these poetic relationships.

One of the most noteworthy parts of this relationship with Andrews was how quickly the mentee became a catalyst to her likely mentor. In 1770, the same year that Wheatley achieved international fame with her elegy for George Whitefield, Andrews began her manuscript volume of poetry graced with the neatly scripted title page "POEMS, Interspersed with PROSE, 1770," followed by a complete table of contents. The book does not contain Andrews's name, but the many nominal references in the

verse identified her to those in her society. The design of the commonplace book in this way points to a poet with literary ambitions and a sense of her role in the local coterie. Wheatley's local fame may well have encouraged Andrews to begin her manuscript volume, just as Wheatley's transatlantic hit, the Whitefield elegy, had served as a springboard for Jane Dunlap's print volume.⁸

A year later, Wheatley again inspired her likely mentor to action. At the same time that Wheatley had begun to press her plight as a slave more explicitly in verse, Andrews was emboldened to make similar political claims. Just two months before Wheatley's verse was shipped to England, Thomas Wooldridge made his visit to the Wheatley household to authenticate Wheatley as a poet for the abolitionist sympathizer Lord Dartmouth. The poem that Wheatley addressed to Lord Dartmouth in 1772 was arguably one of her most forcefully political to date—it candidly connects Wheatley's "love of Freedom" to her own experience as a slave. Though Andrews was not present for this poetic encounter, she most certainly heard about it soon thereafter. And it most likely struck a chord with her, given that Wooldridge, like many in the Barrell family, was a merchant with business between London, British North America, and the British West Indies. While Wheatley's manuscript traveled to a London transformed by the *Somerset* case, in which Lord Mansfield ruled that English common law did not support slavery, Andrews staked the earliest known claim in verse on the antislavery meaning of Wheatley's published volume.⁹ Why did Andrews seize this moment to write her only known statement against slavery, and to what extent did it matter that she did?

The available evidence suggests that whatever poetic relationship existed between Andrews and Wheatley was a complicated one. Andrews may have promoted Wheatley's poetry and at least a version of her political vision in part because Andrews wanted to ride on Wheatley's coattails. The correspondence between John Andrews and William Barrell reveals that Andrews had sought her brother's attention for her poems and had lost it to Wheatley. John explains to William on September 22, 1772, that Andrews refused to send along her own elegy on their recently deceased nephew, Charles Eliot, and, instead, enclosed only Wheatley's elegy:

The 3rd Instant I wrote by the post acquainting you with the death of little Charles, Ruthy has inclosed you by this opp: a Poem by P. Wheatly

addressd to your father on this melancholly occasion, w^{ch} I think is a masterly performance, but dont know whether youll be able to read it, as it was transcribd by Leveritt, who is but a bungling hand at any thing. Ruthys muse inspird her likewise & producd a very pretty, affectionate performance address to her sister, but being anticipated by the former, w^{ch} she tho^t much preferable to her own, (tho by the way I don't think it was, when viewd in the connection it was wrote, as it would not admit of that flowery language that runs through y^e whole of Phillis's) it was with difficulty that I could prevail on her to send it also, nor could I obtain a copy by any means to send you, as she says you neglected taking any notice of some performance in poetry she formerly sent you.

This brief mention of Andrews's reaction points to her own recognition of her irrelevance next to Wheatley. Perhaps this is what motivated Andrews to declare Wheatley's merits and her poetry's implications for slavery in no uncertain terms.

The correspondence between John and William also points to a competitive though collaborative relationship between the two women poets—which one would expect from writers in the same coterie. Seeing the emotional effect of Phillis's exceptional talent on his wife, John makes the point of defending why he thinks Ruth's poem is the better composition: Ruth's elegy highlights its familial connection while Phillis's emphasizes her role as the sublime poet. John's assessment that the most substantial difference between the two poems is their respective circuits of address, which entail the use of direct versus flowery language, is an accurate analysis. Apart from this, the elegies are quite similar, which suggests some type of collaboration. Wheatley, who made a habit of responding elegiacally immediately, beat Andrews to the task by one day. When Andrews saw Wheatley's elegy, she may have responded by remaking it to emphasize a familial address. Another equally plausible scenario is that the two poets consulted each other on the subject and the basic narrative before attempting their separate compositions. Neither of these possibilities would have been unusual among manuscript poets.¹⁰

In such a poetic relationship, it would seem strange if a fellow poet did not comment on the other poet's success or failure. For example, Joseph Green famously mocked his friend Mather Byles for his aspirations of transatlantic fame. When Wheatley's book manuscript made its way across

the Atlantic toward a possible London publication, Andrews recognized it as an opportune moment. Since the Mansfield decision had struck a severe blow to slavery that summer, the barbaric institution seemed on the verge of crumbling in England. As David Waldstreicher has so elegantly pointed out, this was a decisive time in England and America—the beginning of the “Mansfieldian” or “Wheatleyan moment,” “when leading whites were forced to respond to the art and politics of slaves and their allies” (522). For an amalgam of reasons, perhaps beyond the historian’s ability to parse out, the white poet Andrews proactively attempted to shape the reception of Wheatley’s volume in this conversation.

While the reception and impact of the poem “Slavery” is uncertain, Andrews’s poetic volume undeniably circulated at least among her poetic coterie in Boston, as well as exchanged hands in Philadelphia, New York, and possibly the West Indies.¹¹ The carefully crafted collection in a journal embossed “Poems” on the spine is unambiguously a final draft with no visible work-in-progress or editorial marks. Several poems in the collection point to their own circulation, including a reference to a friend to whom Andrews lent the entire volume, an expected practice of manuscript poets (118). Another poem, “To the Same,” one of many addressed to her best friend (and Rev. John Lathrop’s future wife), Miss Checkley, reflects a playful poetic exchange between the two women. The poem is an answer to Miss Checkley’s lines “You know the Muses never send / Their aid to your dull stupid friend!” (60). Andrews responds that only pride keeps Miss Checkley from “displaying her talents at Rhyme” (61). These jests indicate that the poems circulated quickly among friends.

The lines also provide important clues about the presence of the poem “Slavery” among Andrews’s local coterie. The friendly banter confirms that within days of composing “Slavery” Andrews had exchanged poems and encouraged at least one person to respond in verse and to display her talents. Such activity suggests that Andrews could have also shared the poem “Slavery” near the date of its composition, and perhaps even read it to others gathered in her (or another’s) home while they anticipated the arrival of Wheatley’s manuscript in London.¹² This would be necessary if Andrews was hoping to gain something by defining Wheatley’s moment because she would need to make the poem public to do so. This evidently would have pleased the Wheatleys, who were vigorously promoting the poet, as it seems unlikely that Andrews would have included the poem in

her circulating volume if it was not supported, or at the very minimum not condemned, by Susanna Wheatley. Though the poem on Wheatley appears singular in the volume for its political content, it should be understood as traveling in the same circuit as the rest of the collection.

Though there is not yet definitive evidence regarding the specific reception of Andrews's poem, if it reached her brother in Philadelphia like some of her other poetry, it may well have had a discernible impact on anti-slavery debates there. Just two months after Andrews penned "Slavery," the Philadelphian physician Benjamin Rush enlisted the example of Wheatley, this "Negro Girl . . . whose singular genius and accomplishments are such as not only do honor to her sex, but to human nature," in *An Address to the Inhabitants of the British Settlements in America, upon Slave-Keeping* (2n). At this point, Rush had only heard of Wheatley secondhand, possibly through his wife, Julia Stockton Rush, who had at least one of Wheatley's poems (Carretta, *Biography* 89). If Andrews's brother William circulated his sister's poem along with Wheatley's verse in Philadelphia, which was more likely at this time given the recent guilt trip that John laid on William for not taking notice of Ruth's verse, Rush may have taken his cue from Andrews to enlist Wheatley as a proof against slavery.¹³

The poem "Slavery" is quite provocative not only for its early but also its extended use of Wheatley as an argument against slavery in a growing conversation surrounding its legality in the British Empire. It displays a grander tone than many of Andrews's other poems, which gives a sense of an expanded circuit of address that speaks not only to her coterie but to the colonies and London. It also alludes to, and then categorically dismisses, Wheatley's signed attestation. While the elite men of Boston were asked to attest to the mere fact of black authorship, Andrews claims the authority to speak to the poetry's quality and the poet's personhood—and this through pointing out that the "merit" of "Phillis" and her poems can be rendered objectively certain by the poems themselves. While a signed document, or even a presumptuous poet, may attest to them, the verse "speak[s] a soul." In a common rhetorical move, Andrews defers to a "far sublimer" poet then herself to adequately praise Wheatley; instead, she "dare[s]" to outline the political ramifications of Wheatley's aesthetic pursuits. The final section reads as if the poet were a student of Wheatley's poem "On Imagination," from which she gleaned that "no Earthly power can enslave the brain." The poet acknowledges that Wheatley's sorrows are "extensive and

enlarged,” but explains that the enslaved poet keeps them at bay through “an inborn fortitude.” One of the four cardinal virtues, this type of fortitude is a God-given, reasoned, and resolute commitment to the truth that never wavers or gives in to fear. Andrews portrays Wheatley as one embodying this virtue in this indefatigable quest for equality, a person who cannot not “[feel] superior to chains” in her “ingenious breast.”

With these arguments, Andrews intervenes in a pressing public discourse surrounding the meaning and consequence of African genius. Interestingly, Andrews’s entire poem anticipates the proslavery arguments that Samuel Estwick, a man firmly rooted in the West Indies through marriage and land, makes in specific relation to the free Jamaican poet and scholar Francis Williams:

Although a Negroe is found, in Jamaica or elsewhere, ever so sensible and acute; yet if he is incapable of moral sensations, or perceives them only as beasts do simple ideas, without the power of combination, in order to use (which I verily believe to be the case); it is a mark that distinguishes him from the man who feels and is capable of these moral sensations, who knows their application and the purposes of them, as sufficiently, as he himself is distinguished from the highest species of brutes. (79n)

Williams had been at the heart of arguments surrounding black inferiority for some time. He was a high-profile and divisive figure in Jamaica at the same time that Andrews’s father and several of her brothers were actively trading with, or lived in, the West Indies and London. In the two years before Andrews crafted her poem, the meaning of Williams’s genius had again preoccupied both proslavery and antislavery advocates.¹⁴ It would seem almost natural, then, for Andrews to allude to him as she elevated Wheatley’s genius, feeling, and virtue.

Andrews’s final poetic gesture moves outward from Wheatley to all “our untutor’d blacks” who “may yet display / Virtues which Heaven approves, and will survey.” These last lines of the poem echo and answer the prayer that concludes Williams’s only surviving poem, “An Ode”: “Then this my pray’r—‘May earth and heaven survey / A people blest, beneath your sway!’” (224). While this may well be mere coincidence—after all the English translation of the poem, which was composed in Latin in 1759, would not appear in print until Edward Long included it in his *History*

of *Jamaica*, published in London in 1774—the similarity gives pause. Did the Barrell family have access to the poem in manuscript? In English? Was Andrews's poem not only an explicit attempt to offer up the newest representative of black genius as proof of the cruel injustice of slavery but also a specific response to, and extension of, Williams's verse? Admittedly, these are tenuous connections, but they are important questions to consider in the continuing research on manuscript verse circulation.

When Williams and Wheatley appeared in these early arguments they were often brief mentions in a footnote. Rush even deleted his footnote on Wheatley in the second edition of his *Address*. In contrast, Andrews placed Wheatley at the very core of her poem. The discovery of a contemporaneous, white female manuscript poet who engaged Wheatley in verse and boldly attempted to define the political meaning of her "comprehensive poems" expands the possibilities for understanding Wheatley's relationships with local poets. Further research and analysis of Ruth Barrell Andrews's poetry and the contexts through which it traveled promise to help answer salient questions about these poetic networks and the various purposes they served in the Wheatleyan moment.

Slavery

Sure some great cause as yet remains conceal'd
 Yet undiscover'd, and yet unreveal'd—
 Why tyrant man should thus reflect disgrace,
 Why cast an odium o'er the human race.
 Why half Mankind the other half enslave,
 Why base injustice should Dominion have.
 The Africans, our equals best can say
 Too long accustom'd to a lawless sway.
 How great the conflict in a noble breast
 To breathe in bondage to exist oppress'd
 Barter'd as menials from their native shore
 Which they reluctant leave, & see no more.
 Wafted¹⁵ forever from a genial soil
 Unhappy prisoners, enslaved to toil
 Despised as miscreants, branded with disgrace

And disallow'd the level of their race.
 We've recent proof that dignity of mind
 Is not to color or to rank confin'd
 A *youthful female* of this *sable* tribe
 Enrich'd with wisdom unalay'd by pride
 Her elegance of thought must clearly prove,
 The rays of knowledge, brighten from above.
 Where can we boast a genius of our own
 Whose rare abilities have her's outshone?
 Her nat'ral graces yet unrival'd beam,
 And teach the value of a soul* within:
 The merit *Phillis* may with justice claim
 Her comprehensive poems ascertain:
They speak a *soul* beneficently great
 A *soul* whose magnitude surmounts her fate
 My pen shall not presume to paint her praise,
 I leave the Theme to far sublimer lays.

I only dare, tho humbly to maintain
 No Earthly power can enslave the brain.
 Nor all the scorn which insolence bestows,
 Can rob the mind where innate greatness flows
 That being feels superior to chains,
 And every tryal of this life sustains.
 It dignifies a freedom nought can wrest
 Or ever tare from the ingenious breast.
 This consolation only can appease
 Sorrows extensive and enlarged as these.
 Sorrows which magnanimity can swell,
 An inborn fortitude may oft repel
 And our untutor'd blacks may yet display
 Virtues which Heaven approves, and will survey.

1st December, 1772.

Taken from the earliest known copy held at the Boston Public Library. The Massachusetts Historical Society 1791 copy by Theodore Barrell, Jr., contains slight changes in punctuation.

*An alternative, though less plausible, reading of the manuscript is “And teach the value of a soil within.” Andrews appears to have mistakenly written the word “soil,” which Theodore Barrell, Jr., retained in his copy.

To Mrs. Eliot on the Death of Her Child

Much do I wish a sisters mind at ease,
 O, that her poignant grief I could appease,
 Yet such the cause from whence her sorrows spring,
 The wish! were vain, and hope! is on the wing.
 For could a tender sympathy make less
 Your great affliction! your severe distress!
 Soon had your swollen bosom found relief
 From one who shares a part in all your grief:*
 I feel your loss! — for sure your loss is *mine*,
 But Heaven! is just — and we must not repine.

To me your child was infinitely dear
 As now is witness'd by the falling tear:
 'Tis for ourselves alone, we breathe these sighs!
 Or find the drops just starting from our eies!
 Think my dear sister that this stroke severe
 Firmly evinces the Almighty's care!
 His mind all innocence, no vice could stain,
 The pure ideas of an infant's brain.

Thus in a state of purity within
 His soul unsullied with the marks of sin
 Our heav'nly father view'd him with delight
 And then withdrew him, from a parents sight.

While Seraphs wafted through ethereal air
 The happy object of your earthly care,
 Encircled with felicity and Love!
 Safely convey'd him to the realms above!

Of this we'r[e] sure! — then can you want again
 Your darling Charles, to pass one hour of pain?
 Or wish in your imagination wild,
 One dear embrace from you departed child?

Had he still flourish'd to mature age

His life 'tis possible, on this vast stage
 Had not been equal to the hopes you form'd
 From early beauties which his face adorn'd.
 Had *vanity* o'er Virtue gain'd controul
 And soil'd the snowey whiteness of his soul.
 You in the anguish of your heart had cried
 "Oh! that in infancy my Charles had died!
 When he fair spotless, on my bosom lean'd
 And his young mind with dawning Virtue beam'd."

Regret not now those lost fond hours which *he*
 With sweet engaging smiles afforded thee,
 But Bless! your Maker, that *to you was given*
*Two lovely Babes, who' form a part of Heaven!***

2nd September, 1772.

Taken from the earliest known copy held at the Boston Public Library. Bold font indicates multiple underlines; underlining in manuscript is indicated here by italics. The Massachusetts Historical Society 1791 copy contains slight changes in punctuation and the addition of the initial "E." to the title for Elizabeth Eliot's first name.

*Referring to the recent death of Ruth's and Elizabeth's mother.

**Referring to Elizabeth and Samuel Eliot's first child, Elizabeth, who was born in 1767 and died the same year.

NOTES

I would like to thank the Massachusetts Historical Society for supporting my book-in-progress on evangelical poetry through a long-term NEH grant, which enabled the discovery of Andrews's poem. The research presented in this article is part of my second book project on early American women poets. I would also like to thank Special Collections at the Boston Public Library whose anonymous archivist included a folder of genealogical material and research with the collection that verified my initial assignment of Ruth Barrell Andrews as the author of the MHS copy. I would also like to thank Sandra Gustafson and the outside readers for generously shaping the final version of this essay.

1. In her essay "Our Phillis, Ourselves," Brooks established the centrality of white women's manuscript culture in Wheatley's poetic rise by focusing on Wheatley's elegies. For a detailed description of the events leading up to Wheatley's publication, see both Brooks's article and Carretta's biography of Wheatley. While both scholars mention Ruth Barrell Andrews neither identifies her as a poet who is invested in Wheatley's work.

2. The Boston Public Library also holds several of Ruth Barrell Andrews's letters, some written in verse (Letters to Joseph Barrell). The manuscript volume of verse at the Massachusetts Historical Society has been unknown to scholars in part because it was mistakenly catalogued as the commonplace book of Theodore Barrett, Jr. However, the book is signed Theodore Barrell, Jr., Boston, May 7, 1791. It is an incomplete copy of Ruth Barrell Andrews's manuscript volume. In addition to those at the library and the society, a large number of papers of the extended Barrell family survive in various collections, including those housed at the New-York Historical Society, New York Public Library, Butler Library at Columbia University, Maine Historical Society, and New London County Historical Society.
3. While Joseph Green has begun to receive his dues through the scholarship of David Shields, Ruth Green Barrell's participation in the early poetic culture of Boston requires further work. See John Barrell's letterbook for evidence of his and Ruth Green Barrell's active participation in Joseph Green's poetic circle.
4. For Ruth Barrell Andrews's versified correspondence with her brother Joseph Barrell see her letters at the Boston Public Library. In a letter to William Barrell dated January 10, 1775, held at the Massachusetts Historical Society, John Andrews copied the verse that Joseph Green sent his niece. Ruth Barrell Andrews includes her poetic response to her uncle Green's verse dated January 10, 1775, in the manuscript book held at the Boston Public Library ("Poems"). This poem does not appear in the incomplete copy at the Massachusetts Historical Society, which stops abruptly at page 41 after the poem "To Miss Checkley," dated December 4, 1772.
5. Sally Sayward Barrell Keating Wood was the daughter of Ruth Barrell Andrews's brother Nathaniel Barrell and Sarah Sayward.
6. Samuel Eliot's daughter by his second wife, Catherine Atkins, gives a description of Ruth Barrell Andrews in which, despite the sexist minimization of her, she remembers her as a wit and a poet:

Mrs. Andrews was peculiar in most things. Her figure was smaller, more delicate, than those about her; her feet and hands were small and prettily shaped; her complexion was fair and soft; her eyes were bright but small, her voice variable and low, and her enunciation so slow and measured that each word had a space to itself, so that one felt entitled to something better than common. Fortunately, some quickness of wit and repartee, with a flavor of sarcasm, kept up attention and interest. This fairy-like figure was always dressed in rich silks of delicate hues, with much fine lace about the head and throat. It seems to me as if she was always seated in an arm-chair like a throne, with a footstool, and holding a fan or screen. I never recollect seeing her occupied with any woman's work, or hearing of her undertaking any, beyond a little drawing with pen and ink, a little versifying, or a little reading. But a wife, and mother of four children, must have been forced sometimes to real work;

perhaps it was skill and refined taste that kept it out of sight. Mrs. Andrews certainly had attractive powers and qualities, for my father and mother were much attached to her, and they estimated her by different though equally generous standards. Intercourse between the families was frequent; visits were often exchanged, beginning with dinner at three o'clock, and ending with supper at nine, after a rubber of whist. There was much fun, repartee, and animation, at these meetings, among the elders, I am told (for this was before my time); but to the younger portion of the family they were more discipline than pleasure. (Ticknor 18–19)

While this familial biography of Samuel Eliot contains several poems, including verse penned by Samuel Eliot and Catherine Atkins, there is no mention of Ruth Barrell Andrews's elegy on Charles Eliot, nor the inclusion of any of her or Wheatley's verse. The book does include a letter written by Samuel Eliot in which he refers to sharing Wheatley's elegy on Charles Eliot.

7. Carretta suggests that it was Mather Byles who gave Wheatley's earliest known poem to Jeremy Belknap (*Phillis Wheatley* 48).
8. Interestingly, while Dunlap praises Whitefield and downplays Wheatley, Andrews downplays Whitefield and praises Wheatley. Dunlap's 1771 book of poems in celebration of the late Whitefield credits Wheatley in a back-handed compliment:

Shall his due praises be so loudly sung
By a young Afric damsel's virgin tongue?
And I be silent! and no mention make
Of his blest name, who did so often speak. (4)

Andrews includes one poem in her manuscript that mentions Whitefield entitled "A Very Silly Note," which was written months before his death. In it she parodies a note sent by her soon-to-be husband, John Andrews, that strongly encourages her not to go hear Whitefield preach while she is ill.

9. Andrews's investment in abolition, however, is murky at best. The fervency of Andrews's poem does not seem entirely extraordinary given that her sister's family was well known in Boston for its antislavery sentiments. However, many in her immediate and extended family owned and traded slaves, including her father and her nephew, Theodore Barrell, Jr., with whom she kept a close correspondence and shared her volume of poetry. Unless more evidence comes to light, it seems Andrews's initial passion dissipated, as did that of many of Wheatley's white British North American supporters.
10. Wheatley wrote her poem "On Recollection" after a woman suggested that she write it, which points to other moments in which Wheatley engaged the local poetic coterie in standard verse challenges. There is some additional evidence in Andrews's manuscript volume that Andrews and Wheatley might have prodded and responded to each other. Andrews includes a prose piece that meditates on fancy, which might be a counterpart to Wheatley's "On Imagination." Andrews

also concludes her volume with the poem "Retrospection" more than a decade after Wheatley's "On Recollection," which may acknowledge Wheatley's earlier poem.

11. As already mentioned, there is direct evidence that Ruth Barrell Andrews's poems were sent to her brother in Philadelphia. There is indirect evidence that her poems may have traveled to the West Indies and New York through her nephew Theodore Barrell, Jr. (named for her brother Theodore Barrell though son of her brother Walter Barrell, who was a slave trader along with her own father, John Barrell). Theodore, Jr., grew up in the West Indies, where his Loyalist father fled, but returned to the colonies for a time, during which he copied the first half of Andrews's manuscript volume in May 1791, and then left to live in Demerara in July 1791. He kept in close contact with Andrews and may have taken her poetry with him. He eventually returned to the United States and died in New York. He was a slave owner who firmly believed in the inequality of Africans and railed against both abolitionists and the evils of West Indian slavery in his old age. His copy of Andrews's poetry book raises many questions about its circulation that require further research. Additionally, Andrews corresponded with many others in her family who were Loyalists and fled Boston, including some to Halifax and London with the Winslow family, who may have taken her poetry.
12. See Brooks on Wheatley's domestic poetic performances. On the domestic performance culture of Boston, see Kelley.
13. John Andrews sent several of Wheatley's, Ruth Barrell Andrews's, and his own poems to William Barrell in Philadelphia. While the extant letters between John Andrews and William Barrell do not mention the transmission of "Slavery," they do refer to missing letters by Ruth.
14. See Carretta's essay "Who Was Francis Williams?" from which this material is drawn and which covers the poet's disruptive presence in the West Indies in greater detail.
15. It is worth noting that Andrews uses the term "wafted" to refer to Wheatley's experience of the Middle Passage as well as to the experience of the soul transported by angels to heaven in her elegy on Charles Eliot. The term deserves extended analysis for its ambiguity: it can refer to being carried in flight by wind, angels, or magic, or to convoy a ship. This second meaning was obsolete by the seventeenth century except for poets who used it to refer to being carried across water, including the popular eighteenth-century poet Edward Young in *Night Thoughts*. The term, which may either be laced with a striking material reference to the Middle Passage or wash over the event with the word's gentle and ethereal sense, evokes Wheatley's use of the innocuous term "brought" in one poem, and the more sinister term "snatch'd" in another, to refer to own experience of the slave trade. Wheatley also uses the word "wafted" in two of her poems: "To a Gentleman and Lady on the Death of the Lady's Brother and Sister, and a Child of the Name *Avis*, Aged One Year" ("Your sighs are wafted to the skies in vain")

and “To a Clergyman on the Death of His Lady” (“Thy sighs no more be wafted by the wind”), both of which refer to the vain actions and sorrows of men in the face of Providence.

WORKS CITED

- Andrews, John. Letter to William Barrell. 29 May 1772. MS. Andrews-Eliot Manuscripts, 1772. Massachusetts Hist. Soc., Boston.
- . Letter to William Barrell. 22 Sept. 1772. MS. Andrews-Eliot Manuscripts, 1772. Massachusetts Hist. Soc., Boston.
- . Letter to William Barrell. 10 Jan. 1775. MS. Andrews-Eliot Manuscripts, 1774. Massachusetts Hist. Soc., Boston.
- Andrews, Ruth Barrell. Letters to Joseph Barrell. 1765. MS. Letters and Manuscript, 1765–90. Boston Public Lib., Boston.
- . Letter to Theodore Barrell, Jr. 27 March 1795. MS. Barrell Family Papers. Series I Correspondence, 1751–1841. Butler Lib., Columbia U, New York.
- . “Poems, Interspersed with Prose.” MS. Letters and Manuscript, 1770. Boston Public Lib., Boston.
- Barrell, John. “Letterbook.” 1730s–1750s. MS. New-York Hist. Soc., New York.
- Brooks, Joanna. “Our Phillis, Ourselves.” *American Literature* 82.1 (2010): 1–28.
- Carretta, Vincent. *Phillis Wheatley: A Biography of a Genius in Bondage*. Athens: U of Georgia P, 2011.
- . “Who Was Francis Williams?” *Early American Literature* 38.2 (2003): 213–37.
- Dunlap, Jane. *Poems, upon Several Sermons, Preached by the Rev’d, and Renowned, George Whitefield, While in Boston*. Boston, 1771. *America’s Historical Imprints*. Web. 22 May 2016.
- Estwick, Samuel. *Considerations on the Negroe Cause Commonly So Called, Addressed to the Right Honourable Lord Mansfield. Lord Chief of the Court of King’s Bench, &c.* 2nd ed. London, 1773. ECCO. Web. 22 May 2016.
- Kelley, Mary. *Learning to Stand and Speak: Women, Education, and Public Life in America’s Republic*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 2006.
- Rush, Benjamin. *An Address to the Inhabitants of the British Settlements in America, upon Slave-Keeping*. Philadelphia, 1773. *Early American Imprints*. Web. 22 May 2016.
- Ticknor, Anna. *Samuel Eliot*. Boston, 1869. *HathiTrust*. Web. 22 May 2016.
- Waldstreicher, David. “The Wheatleyan Moment.” *Early American Studies* 9.3 (2011): 522–51.
- Williams, Francis. “An Ode.” *Phillis Wheatley: Complete Writings*. Ed. Vincent Carretta. New York: Penguin, 2001.

PETER P. REED, associate professor of English at the University of Mississippi, is the author of *Rogue Performances: Staging the Underclasses in Early American Theatre Culture* (Palgrave, 2009) and essays on race and performance in the Caribbean and Atlantic world.

WENDY RAPHAEL ROBERTS is the recent recipient of two long-term National Endowment for the Humanities fellowships, one at the American Antiquarian Society and the other at the Massachusetts Historical Society, for her monograph in progress on early evangelical verse. Her essay "Evangelical Print Culture" is forthcoming in the first volume of *The Blackwell Companion to American Literature*.

KAREN ROSENTHALL is a doctoral candidate in the Department of English at Rice University. She has presented her research at MLA, C19, the Society for Early Americanists, and American Literature Association conferences.

ANA SCHWARTZ is a doctoral candidate in the English Department at the University of Pennsylvania, reassessing affect's utility and perseverance as a biopolitical discipline of American settlement since early modernity. Her dissertation argues that colonial Puritanism has not passed.

SABRINA STARNAMAN is a clinical assistant professor of literary studies at the University of Texas at Dallas. Her research focuses on Progressive Era (1880–1930) American texts about women, urbanism, and disability. Currently she is completing a manuscript titled "Deforming the Neighbors: Cross-Class Urban Relations in Progressive Era Literature" and is developing a multimedia project inspired by Rebecca Harding Davis's *Life in the Iron Mills* with digital artist and media scholar Xtine Burrough. She teaches courses on women's literature, ethnic American Literature, literature and science, and nineteenth-century American Literature. She has an MA from Columbia University and a PhD in literature from the University of California, San Diego.

KAREN STOLLEY is professor in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at Emory University. Her scholarship focuses on colonial and eighteenth-century Latin American literary and cultural studies and the transatlantic Hispanic eighteenth century. Recent publications include *Domesticating Empire: Enlightenment in Spanish America* (Vanderbilt UP, 2013); "Catastrophe and Colony: Looking South" (*Common-place.org*, 1 Dec. 2014); and an issue of the *Colonial Latin America Review* on "Latin American Enlightenments," coedited with Mariselle Meléndez (2015). Her essay "Writing Back to Empire: Juan Pablo Viscardo y Guzmán's 'Letter to the Spanish Americans'" appeared in *Liberty/Égalité/Independencia: Print Culture, Enlightenment, and Revolution in the Americas, 1776–1826* (Oak Knoll, 2007).

KAREN WEYLER is a professor of English at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. She is the author of *Intricate Relations: Sexual and Economic Desire in American Fiction, 1789–1814* (U of Iowa P, 2004) and *Empowering Words: Outsiders and Authorship in Early America, 1760–1815* (U of Georgia P, 2013). With Robert Battistini and Michael Cody, she is editing *The Literary Magazine and*

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.