

### Editions Theory

Anne Bradstreet's work went through several publication editions, and it would seem relevant to the pedagogical argument of "Bradstreet's Juvenilia" to examine closely each of these editions, so as to support and explain the evolution of her writing from strictly public sphere to extremely intimate private domain. Moreover, the changes in the editions, and the presentation or publication styles of each, can tell us more about the cultural venues in which they came to light and were shared with a colonial and London readership. The reason why Bradstreet's early, and later and/or posthumous, poems are so different from each other is because they served completely different audiences: the early poems served the needs of pedagogy; the later poems served the needs of personal and private expression. We can clearly see this difference in a close examination of the editions, with the modestly controversial insistence that there was indeed a 1642 Manuscript, separate from the 1650 *Tenth Muse*, which contained only the first four Quaternions<sup>1</sup> and the dedicatory poem to Thomas Dudley, her father.

A comparative look at the kinds of poems, in terms of form, content, and style, contained in the 1642 Quaternions and then in the 1678 *Several Poems* edition, reveals an even greater contrast than to the 1650 *Tenth Muse*. The last Quaternion of the 1642 Manuscript, "The Four Ages of Man," Bradstreet makes an ingenious conclusion to the entire set, wherein she connects the four ages of man (Childhood, Youth, the Manly, and Old Age) back to the four humours (Choler, Blood, Melancholy, Phlegm)<sup>2</sup>, the four

---

<sup>1</sup> All scholarship unto this point has conflated the editions, and has not explored the possibility that the Quaternions circulated as manuscript prior to their collation in the *Tenth Muse*, eight years later. Again, I hold this assumption as not merely a bit of Bradstreetian esoterica, but as a keystone to the editions-pedagogical argument.

<sup>2</sup> These are the terms Bradstreet used; they were also called: "Yellow Bile" for Choler; and "Black Bile" for Melancholy.

elements (Fire, Air, Earth, Water), and the four seasons (Winter, Spring, Summer, Autumn):

Lo now four other act upon the stage,  
 Childhood and Youth, the Manly and Old Age:  
 The first son unto phlegm, grandchild to water,  
 Unstable, supple, cold, and moist's his nature.  
 The second, frolic, claims his pedigree  
 From blood and air, for hot and moist is he.  
 The third of fire and choler is composed  
 Vindicative and quarrelsome disposed.  
 The last of earth, and heavy melancholy,  
 Solid, hating all lightness and all folly.<sup>3</sup>

Compare this verse (1642) of twelve lines to twelve lines from "Another," (1678) a late lyric and one of four "husband" poems. The differences in tone, technique, form, style, and content are striking; and moreover, they imply that Bradstreet's early poems were used for innocent pedagogy, whereas the later poems were intended only for private consumption. From (the second poem) "Another":

As loving hind that (hartless) wants her deer<sup>4</sup>,  
 Scuds through the woods and fern with hark'ning ear,  
 Perplext, in every bush and nook doth pry,  
 Her dearest deer, might answer ear or eye: [ . . . ]

---

<sup>3</sup> Hensley, 51. The poem continues with the seasonal references: Childhood is Spring; Youth is Summer; Manhood is Autumn; Old Age is Winter.

<sup>4</sup> The Biblical source for this image is Psalm 42:3: "Like a deer that longs for running streams, my soul longs for you, my God."

Or as the pensive dove doth all alone  
 (On withered bough) most uncouthly bemoan  
 The absence of her love and loving mate,  
 Whose loss hath made her so unfortunate,  
 Ev'n thus do I, with many a deep sad groan,  
 Bewail my turtle true, who now is gone,  
 His presence and his safe return still woos,  
 With thousand doleful sighs and mournful coos.<sup>5</sup>

The clever puns and animal imagery make this poem frankly fun to read; Bradstreet is at once a hind/doe, and a dove, while her husband is a hart/deer and a “turtle”[dove]. The verbs are active and vigorous: the doe “scuds” through the woods; the dove “bemoans, groans, woos, and coos.” These two poems tell us a lot about the contrasts in editions, as well as about the author’s writing life. She knew her readerships, and the protocols of content appropriate to each: The Quaternions were appropriate for teaching early readers, young boys and girls at her likely dame school; whereas the husband poems were for private consumption only, maybe even a form of art-therapy for Anne while Simon was absent in other parts of New England or overseas back in Old England.

In accepting, first, the assumptions that Bradstreet’s work evolved from the 1642 private manuscript (MS) given to her father Thomas Dudley, resulting in, first, the MS or Quaternions’ semi-public use as a pedagogical text; and second, that the publication of the MS and additional poems, including most prominently the “Four Monarchies” quatrain, as the 1650 *Tenth Muse*, I am also asserting that Bradstreet was conditioned

---

<sup>5</sup> Hensley, 229.

by the typical practices of late sixteenth century English print culture. Later, with the posthumous publication of the so-called “second edition” of the *Tenth Muse*, called *Several Poems*, in 1678, and the discovery and idiosyncratic collation of the “Andover Manuscripts” in 1867 by John Harvard Ellis, which included then unseen material containing mostly prose works, the “Meditations,” and other personal pieces such as “Upon the Burning of Our House 1666” (which is the first time we see this poem), and the conversion narrative-style letter, “To My Dear Children,” we can easily trace Bradstreet’s development as a poet in the context of English written arts, who was revising from extant publications or versions ([cf. four-column chart](#)). Because Bradstreet’s early works have been misunderstood, and not considered for their pedagogical application, her entire corpus of writings and editions should be re-examined from a print-history point of view. Like other major English and American writers, for instance Sir Philip Sidney,<sup>6</sup> whose work is scoured for textual variants, so that a deeper explication or a more certain exegesis might be made, I, too, think that Bradstreet’s four publication (i.e. “made public”) events should be examined individually, and compared collectively. The outcome of such an examination might yield some very different conclusions about Bradstreet, not the least of which would be an acceptance of her role as a prolific public writer in the mid-seventeenth century, a role more significant than her nearly fabricated role as Puritan poet (as we shall see in Ellis’ edition).

---

<sup>6</sup> I am thinking here of Sidney’s *Arcadia*, and its two main versions.

Furthermore, people in Bradstreet's time made all sorts of things, practical objects to live with, for food preparation and other husbandry and housewifery necessities.

Bradstreet made, or wrote, poems. I see no reason why we cannot proceed to discuss her "made things," her poems, as artifacts conditioned by her culture.

As she says in her most famous poem, "Here follows some verses upon the burning of our house, July 10th, 1666. Copyed out of a loose Paper":

Here stood that Trunk, and there that chest;  
There lay that store I counted best:  
My pleasant things in ashes lye,  
And them behold no more shall I.  
Under thy roof no guest shall sitt,  
Nor at thy Table eat a bitt.<sup>7</sup>

Material objects, the trunk, the chest, the table, the roof, and even the "loose Paper," are noted by Bradstreet as part of the cultural venue, the stuff of the home which were worthy enough to be described as a loss, if only, later in the poem, to offer these artifacts to God as meagre sacrifice for saving their lives from the fire itself. Indeed, according to Laurel Thatcher Ulrich, who, in *Goodwives*, anticipates the current transatlanticist standard, women of early New England were the keepers of all the articles of the home, and the managers of the household, including children and servants. Ulrich writes, "By English tradition, a woman's environment was the family dwelling and the yards surrounding it":

If one were to draw a line around the housewife's domain, it would  
Extend from the kitchen and its appendages, the cellars, pantries,

---

<sup>7</sup> Hensley, 292.

brewhouse, milkhouse, wash-house, and buttery. . . . The line demarking the house-wife's realm would not cross the fences which defined outlying fields of Indian corn or barley, . . . but, . . . in spells of dearth or leisure, [it would] reach to the shore.<sup>8</sup>

I am intrigued by this description, as it necessarily includes Anne Bradstreet, who was, if nothing else in her own day, a housewife, a “Goodwife,” whose handiwork, her poems, certainly “reached to the shore” and beyond, to the home shore of England.

Although Ulrich's focus is not literary, as she examines typical household inventories in Essex and York Counties in England (as does David Hackett Fischer in *Albion's Seed*), for economic variations in comparison to Northern New England 1650-1750, she does use Bradstreet's poem to her deceased mother, Mrs. Dorothy Dudley, as a kind of dedicatory or prefatory piece to her whole book. Ulrich dates Bradstreet's poem (erroneously) as 1643, which was when Dorothy Dudley died, but not when the poem first appeared in print. This poem, entitled “An Epitaph on My Dear and Ever-Honoured Mother Mrs. Dorothy Dudley, Who Deceased December 27, 1643, and of her Age 61,” first appeared in publication not in the 1650 *Tenth Muse*, but in the 1678 *Several Poems* edition. Again for emphasis, even though the event of the death of her mother pre-dates even the 1650 *Tenth Muse*, it was not contained in it. Ulrich, however, is not concerned with book history or philology. She simply includes the poem as emblematic of what a so-called “Goodwife” meant in seventeenth century New English culture:

A worthy Matron of unspotted life,

---

<sup>8</sup> Laurel Thatcher Ulrich, *Goodwives: Image and Reality in the Lives of Women in Northern New England 1650-1760* (New York: Vintage Books, 1991), 13.

A loving Mother and obedient wife,  
 A friendly Neighbor pitiful to poor,  
 Whom oft she fed and clothed with her store.<sup>9</sup>

Ulrich's inclusion of the Dorothy Dudley epitaph, for her purposes, functions perfectly as the definition of her project, "Goodwife." However, for my purposes, I am also concerned about the dating and publication issues of this poem, as the rest of this chapter will discuss textual facts and possibilities.

Of books and education, Ulrich discusses generalized learning praxis of girls in late seventeenth century New England, in that most were not taught to "write and cypher," only read; as writing and adding/subtracting ("cyphering"/use of numbers) were the skills needed for boys and young men, in order to keep a "Tradesman's book":

What this meant in the daily lives of ordinary women is suggested by extant account books from the period. Although many such books survive, in the entire century between 1650 and 1750, there is not a single one known to have been kept by a woman.<sup>10</sup>

So, although girls, women, and matrons did not typically use blank ledger books to keep their husband's or family's accounts, either for mercantile trade or farming, Anne Bradstreet surely kept a blank manuscript book or pages to write down her poems, just as other matrons kept their family's business records, if casually trained by their spouses, in the event of their being away, overseas, or on other travel. Simon Bradstreet was away

---

<sup>9</sup> Hensley, 204.

<sup>10</sup> Ulrich, 44.

often enough for Anne Bradstreet to write about in her later, private poems, such as “A Letter to Her Husband. Absent Upon Public Employment”:

If two be one, as surely thou and I,  
 How stayest thou there, whilst I in Ipswich lie? . . .  
 O strange effect! now thou art southward gone,  
 I weary grow the tedious day so long;  
 But when thou northward to me shalt return,  
 I wish my sun may never set, but burn  
 Within the Cancer of my glowing Breast,  
 The welcome Home of my dearest Guest.<sup>11</sup>

Given the specific directional references in this poem, Simon must have been south of Ipswich (a.k.a. Aggawam), which could mean Boston or Plymouth, or perhaps even further south, such as Barbados or other sea islands, as the poem takes up the sun/heat/Cancer/Capricorn metaphor in a very prominent way. In any event, Anne was left alone with the household to run and the children to tend to. She thus might possibly have made use of the family account book, and obviously of her own journal.

As with most poets, external and/or cultural forces were influential; however, these effects were not the stuff of current events (such as the news of the deeds of Morton, Hutchinson, or Williams). No, what influenced the editions was more subtle: the necessities of daily life: education of children; husband being gone; family deaths. Moreover, Bradstreet’s poems eventually broke the typical boundaries of a woman’s

---

<sup>11</sup> Hensley, 226.

daily domain as earlier described by Ulrich, in that her manuscript traveled to London, (“absent upon public employment”?), and then returned to circulate in New England. However, neither of these poems, the Dorothy Dudley elegy nor the absent-husband “Letter,” was included in that first edition. Finally, Ulrich also includes the frontispiece from the original *Tenth Muse Lately Sprung Up in America* among a pictorial artifacts section in the middle of *Goodwives*, which also features an embroidery sampler, pie crust vent patterns, a fabric “pocket” or draw-string purse, and various other hearth and home implements, such as a flat-iron, a porridge bowl and ladle, and a hand-size garden hoe. Clearly here Ulrich is equalizing Bradstreet’s poems in the *Tenth Muse* volume with sundry other female hand-made objects. To a non-literature person then, that book was just another pie crust, just another embroidered pocket; a sample of a woman’s handiwork, no more.

~~~~~

Ulrich’s treatment of Bradstreet, in misdating the Dorothy Dudley poem and in equating the *Tenth Muse* with a flat-iron, is for me a typical response to Bradstreet by both historians and literature researchers: There is a willingness to conflate the editions, thus diminishing the value of each, and to present Bradstreet and her poems as emblematic of all Novanglian Puritan culture. In order to correct these tendencies, this chapter will proceed with a review of the editions: the 1642 Manuscript; the 1650 *Tenth Muse*; the 1678 *Several Poems*; and the 1867 Andover Manuscript. It will then consider the small but potent Commendatory Verse “Arme,” which was attached to 1650 *Tenth Muse*; there will be a traditional explication of the poem, and its Interregnum context. The fact that it was not included in 1678 *Several Poems*, will also be examined, while its

connection to “Four Monarchies” within the 1650 *Tenth Muse* will be explored. Then, the role of John Harvard Ellis as Bradstreet’s first modern editor will be discussed, as well as the two main twentieth century editions by Jeanine Hensley, and Robb & McElrath. This chapter will also be organized according to the following question: *How did the original Quaternions function in New English culture of 1642?*

The most important issue here, in terms of the editions, is that Anne Bradstreet did not give her father “The Tenth Muse.” She gave him most likely a manuscript, possibly just loose pages, or possibly collated into some sort of rude folio, of just the quaternions and dedicatory poem. What, then, did it mean to Thomas Dudley to receive an *homage* in the form of a manuscript collection of long poems from his thirty-year-old daughter, twelve years after they all arrived at Cape Ann, Massachusetts? “I bring my four times four, now meanly clad/To do their homage unto yours, full glad.”<sup>12</sup> I have asserted that the true meaning or function of the early poems, the Quaternions dedicated to Dudley, was for pedagogical application, and consequently, for Governor Dudley to have some level of bragging rights in terms of the talents of his clan, and their scrupulous fidelity to the 1642 court ordered mandate<sup>13</sup> for parents to teach their children to read.

“The Four Elements,” for instance, is a likeable if not pedestrian text, perfect for publically-sanctioned use as a school text. Of “Fire,” Bradstreet writes: “Ye cooks, your kitchen implements I frame/Your spits, pots, jacks, what else I need not name/Your daily food I wholesome make, I warm/Your shrinking limbs, which winter’s cold doth

---

<sup>12</sup> Hensley, 13.

<sup>13</sup> See chapter one.

harm.”<sup>14</sup> Of “Earth,” Bradstreet writes: “Thousands in woods and plains, both wild and tame,/But here or there, I list now none to name:/No, though the fawning dog did urge me sore,/In his behalf to speak a word the more.”<sup>15</sup> Of “Water,” Bradstreet says, “There lives the oily whale, whom all men know,/Such wealth but not such like, earth thou may’st show,/The dolphin, loving music, Arian’s friend,/The witty barbel, whose craft doth her commend/With thousands more, . . .”<sup>16</sup> And of “Air,” she says, “Again what furious storms and hurricanoes/Know western isles, as Christophers, Barbadoes,/Where neither houses, trees, nor plants I spare;/But some fall down, and some fly up with air.”<sup>17</sup> These selections are typical of the full verses from which they come; they are benign, yet mildly learned, and charming with common details (food, trees, dogs, whales, dolphins, storms, hurricanes). Because this is what she chose to write about, and her writing is historical and cultural in that it represents a specific period and place, then we can say that the very words of the poem on the Elements point toward a literate, even scientific community or readership. Her Massachusetts culture, as well as that of London, had education as a priority. This poem teaches Natural Philosophy, which to us always seems like an exercise in a firm grasp of the obvious, but for seventeenth century children, it would seem wonderously scientific: the elements and their qualities, with animals.

This long four-part poem also is typical of similar “lesson” poems from the

---

<sup>14</sup> Hensley, 19.

<sup>15</sup> Hensley, 23.

<sup>16</sup> Hensley, 27.

<sup>17</sup> Hensley, 31.

sixteenth century, such as John Rastell's "A New Interlude and a Merry of the Nature of the Four Elements," (1519), which is a lesson on mapping the world. Such verses were commonly used to teach basic information on geography and ancient history, using rhyme for rote reinforcement. Of the elements, earth, land, or the known Continents, Rastell writes:

This north part is called Europe,  
 And the south part is called Africa,  
 The east part is called India.  
 But these new lands [to the west] lately found,  
 Have been called *America*, merely because  
 Americus [Amerigo Vespucci] found them first.<sup>18</sup>

I include this poem to point out that what Bradstreet was doing in the 1642 MS and the 1650 *Tenth Muse* functioned as a conventional use for verse. Rastell's "Merry" was a lesson on the globe; Bradstreet's "Four by Fours" were lessons on what was then considered science. For instance, in any of the Quaternion sets, each of the four kinds of knowledge of the physical world discourse on their attributes, as when Old Age speaks on what it's like to be him; he does so with a conscious inclusion of the other ages:

What you have been, ev'n such have I before,  
 And all you say, say I, and something more.  
 Babe's innocence, Youth's wildness I have seen,  
 And in perplexed Middle-age have been,  
 Sickness, dangers, and anxieties have past,  
 And on this Stage am come to act my last.

---

<sup>18</sup> Jehlen and Warner, 48. Note: This piece is a translation or paraphrase, without the original rhyme scheme or metrical pattern found in the 1519 version.

I have been young, and strong, and wise as you  
 But now, *Bis pueri senes*<sup>19</sup> is too true.  
 In every Age I've found much vanity.  
 An end of all perfection now I see.<sup>20</sup>

Although Rastell's geography lesson is not as highly developed as Bradstreet's lesson on the elements or on the ages of man, the formula is still similar.

From a modern reader's perspective, Bradstreet's works also contain a tension between public and/or occasional poetry, and the private poems and small prose works. Bradstreet's pedagogical poems represent the motivations of an individual artist in a society which generated massive amounts of reading-based, written arts. Additionally, she must have seen herself as part of the Old English vanguard of courtly or moderate Protestant writers, and not part of the new colonial culture. Her early poems rejected a New English cultural aesthetic so completely, that one might guess that she was still sitting by the hearth in Northampton, England. Her later poems, as seen only in the two posthumous editions (1678 and 1867) reveal a complex mind, a very human sense of doubt, an insecurity about her health, her faith, her husband, and the whole New English endeavor. The editions make this tension and contrast very real, as well as provide us with insight into just what a burgeoning Novanglian sensibility looked like, both from its absence or rejection, and from its inclusion (which we will see later in the chapter in the works of Thomas Morton and Roger Williams).

For the purposes of this study, I have looked at the original 1650 *Tenth Muse Lately Sprung Up in America* (London), in the collection of the Clements Library at the

---

<sup>19</sup> "Old men are boys twice."

<sup>20</sup> Hensley, 61.

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor; and at the 1678 *Several Poems* (Boston) electronic facsimile in the “EEBO” (Early English Books On-line) collection, also at the University of Michigan, Harlan Hatcher Graduate Library. I also consulted one of the few extant copies of the original 1678 *Several Poems* in the collection of the John Carter Brown Library at Brown University in Providence, Rhode Island.<sup>21</sup>

Other significant differences between the 1650 and the 1678 printed texts are germane to the pedagogical application, and to the cultural contexts of each: the first being essentially an Interregnum text (MS 1642 --*Tenth Muse* 1650, London); and the second being a Restoration , albeit Contact Period or Colonial, text (*Several Poems* 1678, Boston, Mass.). Specifically, the *Tenth Muse* contains the Commendatory Verse, “Arme Arme”(which I will discuss further); and the closing and printed “signature” of Anne Bradstreet after the deferential and epilogic, “My subjects bare, My brains are bad” verse-rejoinder attached to the last quatrain, the “Four Seasons.”

It reads, “Your dutiful daughter, Anne Bradstreet,” a closing phrase which is significant in two ways: 1) as evidence of the MS’s limited intent as simply a set of “4 x 4’s”<sup>22</sup> dedicated to Thomas Dudley, possibly to seek his governmental approval of their

---

21

Additionally, I will occasionally be using the following abbreviations:

- MS = 1642 Manuscript
- TM = 1650 *Tenth Muse*
- SP = 1678 *Several Poems*
- AMS = 1867 “Andover Manuscripts”
- CV = Commendatory Verse(s)
- AB = Anne Bradstreet

<sup>22</sup> The Four Elements: Fire, Earth, Water, Air; The Four Humours: Choler, Blood, Melancholy, Phlegm; The Four Ages of Man: Childhood, Youth, Middle Age, Old Age; The Four Seasons:

fitness as pedagogical text to be used in conjunction with the 1642 mandatory education literacy act; and 2) as evidence of the conscious act of movement from manuscript form to print form in that this personal closing is not included in the *Several Poems*; we can imagine it signed in the MS and printed in the *Tenth Muse*, yet absent in the more professional *Several Poems*. This was the practical decision of editors aware of a larger readership and market for Anne Bradstreet books. Again, as we have seen in the work of Hall and Amory, very little was left to chance in terms of the history of the colonial book and publication practices, as writing was a controlled activity. All aspects of a book's public presentation and preparation were carefully overseen by editors and printers, as well as legal decency standards which governed content.

However, the most significant omission or absence from the *Tenth Muse* to the *Several Poems* is the Commendatory Verse, "Arme Arme," which is more problematic than the above example in terms of its content. "Arme" is a unique print-cultures puzzle that may reveal an active, political, editorial position shift taken between the *Tenth Muse* and the *Several Poems*. It is a short but dangerous poem, not authored by Anne Bradstreet but clearly initialed/signed by a commendatory agent ("R. Q"), which apparently aims to praise Bradstreet, as do the other Commendatory Verses, if in a back-handed fashion like Nathaniel Ward's verse which teases Bradstreet about being a "Muse"; however, this particular Commendatory Verse contains explicitly political and transatlantic cultural references, unlike the other Commendatory Verses, which merely do their expected share of apologizing (which means both defense and contrition, in the sense of a rhetorical

“apologetics”) on behalf of Bradstreet for the accident of her gender as a writer. Its relevance to this discussion is contained in its cultural value on at least two fronts: that books at that time were a collaborative effort, and commendatory verses were part of that elaborate collaboration; and that the poem itself is not in the tone or content of Puritan poetry. Additionally, this verse is also evidence that the discrete editions should be understood, first, separately, for their print idiosyncracies as well as for their major content changes. It may be helpful here to cite the poem in its entirety:

Arme, arme, Soldados arme, Horse  
 Horse, speed to your Horses,  
 Gentle-women, make head, they vent  
 their plots in Verses;  
 They write of Monarchies, a most se-  
 ditious word,  
 It signifies Oppression, Tyranny, and  
 Sword:  
 March amain to *London*, they'l[!] rise for  
 there they flock,  
 But stay a while, they seldome rise til  
 ten a clock.

*R.Q.*

Several intriguing questions are raised by this Commendatory Verse, other than the modest mystery of who wrote it; i.e. who is “*R.Q.*”?<sup>23</sup>. First, I will consider the first

---

<sup>23</sup> *R.Q.* could be a Latin pun, “*Rex Quo*” meaning “King Who [?]”; thus, *R.Q.* could have been Oliver Cromwell, the English leader and *de facto* “king” during the Interregnum.

edition issue, that it appeared in the 1650 *Tenth Muse*, but not in the 1678 *Several Poems*. John Harvard Ellis and Jeannine Hensley both included “Arme” in their editions of Bradstreet’s works, but those editors were obviously not under any religious or political duress, as might have been editors John Woodbridge and Nathaniel Ward (1650), and John Norton and John Rogers (1678), both in the mid-seventeenth century. I cannot answer fully as to why these editorial decisions were made as they were, other than to point out the obvious, that editors condition and craft the presentation of an author’s text, sometimes unfairly or at least incompletely. Bradstreet’s editors, however, have played a major, sometimes manipulative role in our three-hundred and fifty year encounter with her poems and prose. My job in this chapter is to unpack each edition, so as to reinforce the likelihood that first of all, Bradstreet’s poems were manuscript (copies) used in the public sphere; and only later were seen as “professionally” edited works, printed in post-bellum, pre-Restoration London.

Moreover, the Commendatory Verse “Arme” contains controversial imagery and language which may explain why it was cut from the 1678 *Several Poems* edition. “Arme,” an alternate spelling for “arm” according to the *OED*, generally refers to a weapon (a noun) or to be armed (a verb). It’s an abrupt call to arms, to arm oneself, to prepare for armed conflict, to expect war. “Soldados” is a Spanish word, with Catholic implications, as anything Spanish was shorthand for the Papacy; it means “soldiers.” “Horse/Horse, speed to your Horses” refers to a typical military command, to both arm and mount. Next, “Gentlewomen. . . vent/their plots in Verses” is perhaps the most provocative line, in that it directly refers to Bradstreet’s work as code for sedition; because she “write[s] of Monarchies, a most se-/ditious word,” -- indeed, during the

Interregnum (ca. 1642-1660), the use of the language of monarchy, royalty, and the crown would have been something like treason. After all, Bradstreet's *Tenth Muse*, including the "Four Monarchies" quaternion, found itself published in London squarely in the center of the Cromwellian regime.

To digress a moment from the "Arme" commendatory verse, and in view of my argument about the need for us to distinguish between the 1642 MS and the 1650 London publication of the *Tenth Muse*, the "Four Monarchies" quaternion was probably in its day the most culturally significant piece in that collection. Indeed, it would be hard to overestimate the importance of this long iambic poem, stuffed full of direct and oblique allusions to the very nature of monarchy, as well as to the situation of the English monarchy, to the issues of royal succession, legitimate and otherwise:

Great Alexander did leave issue none,  
 Except by Artabasus' daughter one;  
 And Roxane fair, whom late he married,  
 Was near her time to be delivered. [. . .]  
 A sister Alexander had, but she  
 Claimed not; perhaps, her sex might a hindrance be.  
 After much tumult they at last proclaimed  
 His baseborn brother, Aridaeus named, [. . .]<sup>24</sup>

This passage is contained in the section on the Greek Monarchy, and while on the surface seems simply informational and faithful to the historical truths of Alexandrine

---

<sup>24</sup> Hensley, 150.

succession, is also a window into what the non-Royal Puritan might have thought about the genealogical mess that was the English Crown: the Tudors gone, the Stuarts of both Scottish and English factions, the half-sibling rivalries among Henry's progeny, the perverse intrigue of the Court, etc. One might be able to extrapolate, thus, that Bradstreet and her editors held a cynical view of the royal franchise. If, to paraphrase Michel Foucault, every gesture is a text, then every piece contained in the publication, "The Tenth Muse," authored or unauthored by Bradstreet, is also a "text," part of a purposeful, crafted whole, designed to be aired and read in the public forum; reflective of both the editors and the readers, and of the cultural context. I know "Arme" was not Bradstreet's poem, but it did appear in her first book, but was later expunged from the second edition of that book.

The "Arme" CV continues a little heavy-handedly, and here we may begin to suspect an ironic or even satiric tone, "It [the word 'Monarchy'] signifies Oppression, Tyranny, and/Sword." The derisive mention of the crown also connects this short text to an older, non-moderate brand of Puritanism, that practiced by the "Pilgrims" of Plymouth, that of Separatism, instead of the more moderate Puritanism practiced by the Bay Colony, that of "non-separating Congregationalism." Edmund S. Morgan's book, *Visible Saints* (1963) makes this distinction clear and compelling: The settlers in the Massachusetts Bay Colony were supposedly all non-separating Congregationalists. Thus, is "Arme" evidence that there were Separatist dissenters in the Bay? Why would this opinionated and combative commendatory verse be contained in a moderate, secular book of poems written by a colonial gentlewoman? I cannot answer these questions, but I can comment that the existence of "Arme" in the *Tenth Muse* but not in *Several Poems* is

itself a significant, albeit diminutive, fact of print culture contextualization, which points to an editorial awareness of the exigencies of the times: i.e. London in 1650 was a different literary milieu than Boston in 1678.

“Arme” ends with a swipe at the indolence of royalty and courtiers, “March amain to *London*, they’l[!] rise, for/there they flock [as if silly birds],/But stay a while, they seldome rise til/ten a clock.” On the whole, this Commendatory Verse points to the instability of the transatlantic print culture during the Puritan Interregnum. Because the leaders of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, including the Dudleys, the Bradstreets, and the Winthrops, immigrated under the untenable premise of “Non-Separating Congregationalism” in 1630, well prior to the open socio-political Puritanism practiced during the Interregnum, there was an inexorable tension within this founding community. They were Puritans, but they hadn’t separated from the King’s English or Anglican Church. They settled across the Atlantic and began a theocracy based on English Common Law and a Royal Charter, but they hadn’t separated from English *juris prudence*. “Arme,” on the other hand, although it is only a Commendatory Verse, not authored by Bradstreet, but included by her male editors in her first published collection, gives us a tantalizing glimpse into the post-Charles I, London world, with strains of a culture still full of anti-Catholic, anti-Spanish, anti-courtier, anti-arts, yet pro-Separatist sentiment. This verse is also the only poem in any of Bradstreet’s editions that contains a direct awareness of pedestrian political concerns; thus it is important. Again, it does not appear in the 1678 *Several Poems* precisely because in 1678, the English Monarchy had been restored, and Puritan treason had become interchangeable with Puritan blasphemy. The lines “Gentle-women, [. . . ] they vent/ their plots in Verses;/They write of

Monarchies, a most se-/ditious word,/It signifies Oppression, Tyranny, and/Sword” clearly attaches the *Tenth Muse*, and Anne Bradstreet, to a political agenda, which is safely expunged by the time her works are again published in 1678, in Boston. In summary, I admit that because this poem, “Arme” not written by Bradstreet, is less important than other distinct features between the first two seventeenth century editions; however, it’s all we have. At the very least, “Arme” proves that careful editorial consideration was given to her printed volumes in moving from the 1650 London text to the 1678 version.

In terms of various other philological features among the early texts, Bradstreet’s poem “The Four Monarchies,” is contained in an abridged form in the *Tenth Muse*, *Several Poems*, and Andover MS, but not in the 1642 MS. It concerns ancient kingdoms: the Biblical and classical monarchies of the Assyrians (enemies of the Israelites), the Persians (rich pagans), the Greeks (polytheists), and the Romans (from tribal Romulus to Etruscan Tarquin). Again, she stylized these dynasties suitable for instruction, full of pre-Christian moral lessons, but most likely did not share this poem publically until 1650. The evidence of the publication history of “The Four Monarchies” comes internally, as I have mentioned before, from Bradstreet’s dedicatory poem to Thomas Dudley, which names only the original four quaternions, “The Elements,” “The Humours,” “The Ages of Man,” and “The Seasons,” as being part of her print-gift to her father in 1642.

The last fourth of the historical quaternion “The Monarchies,” on the Romans, was also truncated or abridged by Bradstreet herself in the 1650 *Tenth Muse*. She writes, “After some days of rest. . . [being admittedly of] a confused brevity;/Yet in this Chaos, one shall easily spy,/The vast limbs of a mighty Monarchy.” One wonders if Bradstreet

stopped short of the same lengthy treatment of the previous three monarchies , which average some 20, 30, and 50 pages each, respectively; the Roman Monarchy poem is only four pages long, not only because of the tedium of the form and material (and not because of her house burning; this cause is apocryphal ), but because the history of the Roman Monarchy must ultimately include a history of the Caesars, including the era of Jesus of Nazareth and his execution sentence as facilitated by a Roman tribunal in Jerusalem. Such a history might also have to have included Apostolic Church Fathers, and possibly even the early Papacy. If Anne Bradstreet had finished the Romans, then she might have been accused of New Testament religious historicism and exegesis, (not to mention daring to re-spin Pauline material, vis `a' vis St. Paul's *Epistle to the Romans*), a content area culturally off-limits to an unordained, woman writer, poet, or dame school instructress. Writing on religion usually led to preaching of religion; after all, George Herbert's *Temple* and John Donne's sonnets and satires were all written in the context of each man's vocation as Protestant minister, both before and after their ordinations. Again, this sort of authorial move points to an awareness of the editorial process, and of the conventions of seventeenth century print publication.

*The Complete Works of Anne Bradstreet* (1981), edited by Allan Robb and Joseph McElrath, seeks to restore the prominence of the 1650 *Tenth Muse* as a working template for editorial accuracy -- building upon it, and not upon the 1678 *Several Poems*, for the logic of the collection. But according to Pattie Cowell and Ann Stanford, this edition, while well-intended and exhaustive, raises issues that are salient to the general textual debate; for example, why are Bradstreet's early poems so pedantic, and the later poems so lyric? These queries ultimately remain unresolved:

The editors of the *Complete Works* raise important questions, reminding us of the need for caution in deriving Bradstreet's life and aesthetics from variants between editions. But given that Bradstreet had no responsibility for either edition [the print cultures myths], their emphasis on the *Tenth Muse* rather than on *Several Poems* presents as many problems as other editions. McElrath and Robb do not so much correct earlier texts as provide a useful supplement to them.<sup>25</sup>

Regardless of the comprehensiveness of the Robb/McElrath edition, however, Jeannine Hensley's edition, normally found in franchise bookstores in paperback, is still the working standard for poetry aficionados and scholars alike. It gives us the later Anne Bradstreet, as featured in her personal poems and prose works, while tacitly encouraging the reader to merely skim over the early, long poems. Again, my mission is to re-awaken scholarly and even lay interest in the early poems by examining the mystery of their publication in terms of the cultural context of the eight years between 1642, when the manuscript of the Quaternions was released to Dudley, and 1650, when the Quaternions, and other public sphere poems, were introduced to London readers. McElrath and Robb's edition is a consequence of that event.

Robert Arner's essay, "The Structure of Anne Bradstreet's 'The Tenth Muse'" (1976), reminds us, too, that the "*Tenth Muse* is far more impressive finally when

---

<sup>25</sup> Pattie Cowell and Ann Stanford, *Critical Essays on Anne Bradstreet* (Boston: G.K. Hall, 1983), xi.

it is considered as a unit than when we isolate individual poems for analysis.”<sup>26</sup> Arner argues that the original quaternions (from the Dudley MS) were certainly meant to be read together, “and only when they are can we fully understand and appreciate their author’s achievement”:

In this “view of the whole” [John Woodbridge’s term in his “Epistle”], Anne Bradstreet’s poems, whatever the mediocrity of their rhymes and couplets in isolation, turn out to be closely inter-connected thematically and at times, imagistically as well. . . . [These] inter-relationships. . . make the book more valuable, both as literary history and as poetry. . . <sup>27</sup>

Arner, like Robb and McElrath, posits the claim that the *Tenth Muse* was not just a warm-up for the later *Several Poems* edition; that the *Tenth Muse* was deliberate and fits into the transatlanticist print culture, both for poesy, and from my point of view, for pedagogical applications.

Arner’s approach is updated in Philip Gura’s essay, “Early American Literature at the New Century,” in which Gura advocates for an overhaul of scholarly praxis in the field. No more looking at the literature of British Colonial American as merely a “prologue to the literature of the United States of America” (i.e. the so-called “continuities” track, as posited by Perry Miller, et al.). No more “treating the literature of

---

<sup>26</sup> Robert Arner, “The Structure of Anne Bradstreet’s ‘The Tenth Muse.’” *Discoveries and Considerations: Essays on Early American Literature and Aesthetics*. Calvin Israel, ed. (Albany, NY: State U of New York P, 1976), 47.

<sup>27</sup> Arner, 47-48.

colonial America as though it were [just] that of New England writ large” (i.e. the “Novanglophilia” approach, also championed by Miller). No, said Gura, we must now look at the very significant connection between a text and its culture: “My third and last major point was that precious little work had yet been done in what I termed “popular” literature, specifically through research in the history of the book, and folkore and anthropology. . . . It might make us more sensitive to the transatlantic context of early American culture, . . . .”<sup>28</sup> I agree completely with Gura, although the vestiges of continuities and Novanglophilia, along with “American Exceptionalism,” are in some ways unavoidable in the study of the sources. It’s hard not to try to see patterns of literary development from Bradstreet to Edward Taylor and Phyllis Wheatley; or to avoid “loving” New English cultural artifacts. My study in this chapter is in tune with Gura’s call for more “anthropology,” in that I have sought to detach the editions of Bradstreet’s poems from each other so as to examine them individually in the context of their print dates and circumstances.

The fourth major historical edition was John Harvard Ellis’s; his changed everything. John Harvard Ellis’s (1867) *The Works of Anne Bradstreet*, collated from his reading of the so-called “Andover Manuscripts,” begins with the modest Victorian-like statement by Ellis, “This volume is believed to contain all the extant works of Anne Bradstreet.”<sup>29</sup> It is crucial to notice the title of Ellis’s collection is not “the *Complete*

---

<sup>28</sup> Philip Gura, “Early American Literature at the New Century.” *William & Mary Quarterly* 7, no. 3 (July 2000): 14.

<sup>29</sup> John Harvard Ellis, *The Works of Anne Bradstreet* (1867). (Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1962), v.

Works [emphasis mine]” but just “the Works” of Anne Bradstreet. Similarly, Ellis uses the academically modest qualifier, in the passive voice, “this volume *is believed* [emphasis mine] to contain”; as well as the scholarly construct, “all the *extant* works [emphasis mine] of Anne Bradstreet. Ellis provides a kind of descriptive anthropology or cultural framework for the writings of Bradstreet unknowingly, because he was, in the mid-nineteenth century, working in the tradition of privileged, Novanglian academia. Nevertheless, it would be hard to over-estimate the contributions of Ellis to Bradstreet scholarship, although her principle modern editors, Hensley, McElrath, and Robb, simply subsume Ellis’s work as literary detective or agent into their own. Let’s not forget that it was Ellis who brought to the reading public the now most famous poems of Bradstreet, the ones upon which her modern reputation is based, whether fairly or not.

Ellis was also careful to note the writing-intensive nature of the mid-seventeenth century culture which he was delivering to the public. This feature is echoed in historian Jill Lepore’s work when she appropriates Samuel Purchas’s phrase, “the literall advantage” to explain King Philip’s War. I think this phrase can also be applied to Ellis’s pursuits in bringing a newly packaged Anne Bradstreet to the nineteenth century reading public: “In the early seventeenth century, Samuel Purchas declared that the ‘literall advantage’ meant that literacy makes history possible.”<sup>30</sup> Literacy also makes poetry possible. Ellis knew that the way in which he paginated and prefaced *his* Bradstreet would matter.

Ellis’s own Preface to his Bradstreet edition is a precise and loving description of

---

<sup>30</sup> Jill Lepore, *The Name of War: King Philip’s War and the Origins of American Identity* (New York: Vintage, 1999), 26.

the manuscript as artifact itself: “The miscellaneous writings, . . . are printed from a small manuscript book, which belonged to the author, and which had been kept, since her death, as a precious *relic* [emphasis mine] by her descendants.”<sup>31</sup> He goes on:

It is about six inches high and three and three-quarters inches broad.

The covers are of common sheep-skin, and are very much soiled and worn. The remnants of two small brass clasps still adhere to them.

The paper is yellow, stained with water, blotted with ink, and bears marks of having been much read and handled. It has ninety-eight

pages, the first forty-one of which are taken up with ‘Meditations Diu[v]line and morall,’ in Mrs. Bradstreet’s handwriting [. . . which is] large and distinct,<sup>32</sup>

Ellis also meticulously records any textual, superficial, or print discrepancies in his “relic,” such as the facts that “there are no foot-notes in either of the early editions”; and that “six pages [of the MS] have been at some time cut out”; and that “the manuscript has been scribbled over, apparently by a child.”<sup>33</sup>

Ellis’s work as editor also made him a participant in a discursive culture: that Novanglian culture, nearly homogeneous for two hundred years, in terms of its interest in and elevation of writing, reading, education, and Bible literacy. However, Bradstreet of the mid-seventeenth century, and not of Ellis’s re-making, represents a savvy, witty,

---

<sup>31</sup> Ellis, viii.

<sup>32</sup> Ellis, viii.

<sup>33</sup> Ellis, viii-ix.

versatile, and almost Cavalier poet (in the Sidney poem), whose mastery over her material and format places her back in Old England, with more than a nod to the new claims of New England: to procreate and then to teach. In the seventy-some line “Semiramis” stanza of the “Assyrians” section of the “Four Monarchies” quaternion, Bradstreet creates a picture of the ancient tribal queen Semiramis which is hardly Puritan:

This great oppressing Ninus, dead and gone,  
 His wife Semiramis usurped the throne;  
 She like a brave virago played the rex  
 And was both shame and glory of her sex:  
 [. . .] Her mother Dorceta a courtezan.  
 Others report she was a vestal nun,  
 [. . .] But all agree that from no lawful bed,  
 This great renowned empress issued  
 [. . .] Some think the Greeks this slander on her cast,  
 As on her life licentious and unchaste.<sup>34</sup>

Look at the actual vocabulary in this passage, the evocative words: “virago,” “sex,” “courtezan,” “vestal nun,” “lawful bed”; these are not pale words. This is the language of a poet who is in control and could justify her usage based on cultural context and didactic potential. Instead of a punitive causality, which would have been the lesson or *didache* here, that because of her licentiousness she would be punished, Bradstreet romanticizes and idolizes Semiramis, who over her life time built the wonders of Babylon, including

---

<sup>34</sup> Hensley, 75-6.

the gardens and the Tower of Babel. She was war-like, and in marching east to conquer the rest of the Mesopotamian plane, she was lost with her army, possibly “swept away” in the Indus River, or “the poets feigned her turned into a dove,/Leaving the world to Venus soared above.”<sup>35</sup> She, like Queen Elizabeth I, was a powerful female ruler, who had, then discarded, many lovers or suitors, and who reigned for over forty years. In terms of a cultural contextualization, it’s an obvious step from Semiramis to Elizabeth, and Bradstreet’s readers would have caught the allusion and the adulation. Thus Ellis’s version of Bradstreet is a Victorian misreading of her true nature, as we can see in this poem on a lusty, powerful pagan queen.

For all his good work, however, John Harvard Ellis gave us a skewed portrait of Anne Bradstreet; it was he who gave us the picture of the pious “Mrs. Bradstreet,” the ultimate Puritan religious poet, contemplative and modest. While this image has persisted, and is itself mythic, the reality, that the majority of Bradstreet’s total written lines are neither religious nor familial in content, has been ignored until only recently. Ellis’s strategy was simple: he collated the poems and presented them in his 1867 Charlestown, Massachusetts edition, in a certain order so as to feature those works which he felt were most telling of Bradstreet the poet, and of Puritan, Novanglian culture. Indeed, the first piece included in his Bradstreet edition is the conversion narrative/epistle, “To My Dear Children.” The general outline of the contents of the Ellis’s Bradstreet edition is as follows, as editorially subtitled by Ellis:

I. *Religious Experiences and Occasional Pieces.* These contain all the

---

<sup>35</sup> Hensley, 77.

“Deliverance” poems; the “Occasional Meditations”; the poems on sickness and recovery; the poems on her husband and son’s travels to and returns from England; the “Verses upon the burning of her house, July 10, 1666”; the “Verses [upon] Longing for Heaven, Aug. 31, 1669”; “Submission to Chastisement from God, Sept. 30, 1657,” and various other personal poems which reveal Bradstreet’s discipline as a Christian, as she practices in poem form the four main kinds of prayer: Praise, Thanksgiving, Contrition, and Supplication. Again, this sequestering of some of Bradstreet’s works, hand-picked from the sources, tell us more about Ellis’s agenda than about an older Anne Bradstreet.

II. *Meditations, Divine and Moral*. These include the “Dedication of the Meditations to her son, Simon Bradstreet, March 20, 1664,” and his various Latin translations of same.

III. *Poems*. These include the frontispieces of both the first edition, “Tenth Muse” and the second edition, “Several Poems”; these facsimiles, along with various other pen and ink illustrations or decorations, are unique to the Ellis edition. Also contained in this section are all the Commendatory Verses; the “Anagrams” of Anne Bradstreet’s name; the “Dedication to her father, Thomas Dudley, Esq., March 20, 1642”; “The Prologue”; then the complete texts of the original four quaternions, followed by the “Four Monarchies”; the rest of the poems in this section come from the shorter, occasional and elegiac poems of the 1650 and 1678 editions.

IV. *Posthumous Poems*. These are the most personal, and to Ellis’s sensibilities, the most minor poems of Bradstreet’s corpus, including: “Before the Birth of one of her Children”; the “Verses [i.e. love poems] to her Husband”; “In Reference to her [Eight] Children”; the “Memory” or poems to her three dead grandchildren and daughter-in-law;

[there are no “dead children” poems -- she never lost a child either in childbirth or in infancy]; and the Funeral Elegy for Bradstreet by Rev. John Norton, one of her 1678 editors.<sup>36</sup>

This deliberate collation of Bradstreet’s works, far more heavy-handed, paternalistic and manipulative, than that of John Woodbridge and Nathaniel Ward in the first, 1650 edition; and far more agenda- driven than that of John Rogers and John Norton in the second, 1678 edition. It fulfills its own agenda in that it molds Bradstreet into a *typos* appropriate to its contemporary nineteenth century poetry readers. Indeed, we almost cannot recognize the Bradstreet of her own day, that of a worldly woman in a transatlanticist culture, positioning herself among the giants of English, secular and Protestant poetry and letters, such as Sidney, Raleigh, Du Bartas, and even Queen Elizabeth I, by the very content of her early poems.

Ellis’s edition, more so than the two seventeenth century editions, and more so than the 1967 and 1981 (twentieth century) editions, acts or performs as agent or publicist, in positioning Bradstreet as a religious, early American poet, and not as a secular and transatlanticist British poet. Of all the different versions of Bradstreet, as both a poet and a matron, Ellis’s has been the most influential. This willful editorial decision on Ellis’s part offers to us a Bradstreet-package: an exemplary and devout Puritan, a model mother and wife, a thoughtful and careful poetess. This editorial perspective thus re-inforces the print cultures myths as discussed in the previous chapter regarding the contents of 1642 MS and the 1650 *Tenth Muse*, that the manuscript and the “Muse” were

---

<sup>36</sup> Ellis, lxxiii-lxxv.

virtually the same in terms of total poems, and the supposed ignorance on the part of Bradstreet to have been published in London.

Indeed, according to Perry Miller, in the “Errand into the Wilderness” chapter of the eponymously titled book (1956), Bradstreet *et alia* were indebted to English Protestant literary culture,

The finest creations of the founders -- . . . -- were written in Europe, or else, if actually penned in the Colonies, proceeded from a thoroughly European mentality, upon which the American scene made no impression whatsoever. The most striking example of this imperviousness is the poetry of Anne Bradstreet.<sup>37</sup>

Here I agree with Miller’s take on Bradstreet, that she was essentially “unimpressed” by the New English experience. But Miller was using Bradstreet to hold a slot on his team, if you will, of first-string Puritan writers who were British/English (i.e. short-hand for classy, elegant, not rough and “American”), just as Ellis was using Bradstreet to be an exemplar of religious poetry. Still, Miller’s reading contains some truth: “Anne’s flowers are English flowers, the birds [are] English birds, the landscape is Lincolnshire [England].”<sup>38</sup> Miller, like other editors and readers of the sources, of prose and poetry alike, were ever-hungry for some news from the colonial or contact side of the transatlantic project. Unfortunately, it is only by editorial extrapolation, and not by direct evidence, that we can reconstruct an early New English aesthetic, and in Bradstreet, all

---

<sup>37</sup> Perry Miller, *Errand into the Wilderness* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard U P, 1956), 9.

<sup>38</sup> Miller, 10.

we can find is a New English obligation: to teach her children to read using her early poems.

A few other writers, such as Thomas Morton and Roger Williams, however, responded differently to the New English World, and indeed created a New English aesthetic, in a kind of opposition to Ellis's religiosity and Miller's purity of the canon. Thomas Morton, an iconoclastic and rebellious immigrant directly connected to the Anglican elite back in Old England, was man-handled by that same cadre of Plymouth Pilgrims and Massachusetts Bay Colony Puritans. According to Matt Cohen, the print culture of the transatlantic world was also micro-managed by the Novanglian hegemony of Boston and Plymouth. Cohen argues compellingly that Morton's "Maypole episode" defined what was meant by "publishing" in the seventeenth century: "'Publishing, . . . had a meaning broader than its print-bound connections today -- it included posting or proclaiming documents in a public place; this was the method Morton chose to publicize his densely allusive poetry.'<sup>39</sup> Morton's manipulative antics and record of them in his *New English Canaan* (1637, Amsterdam), flew directly in the face of the diasporic Puritans who sought to control the methods of print circulation in their Novanglian colonies. Without going into great detail about Morton's mid-life crisis at "Ma-re Mount," where he posts a "riddle-poem" to the actual Maypole, conjuring the pagan, Old English, and Elizabethan rituals of celebrating May Day and the vernal equinox, Morton frankly sought to antagonize his Plymouth neighbors, including his print nemesis, Gov. William Bradford. He also traded guns for furs with the Algonquin natives, and certainly

---

<sup>39</sup> Matt Cohen, "Morton's Maypole and the Indians." *Book History*, Vol. 5. Ezra Greenspan, ed. (Univ. Park, Penn.: Penn. State U P, 2002), 2.

caroused willingly with their women: “Give to the nymph that’s free from scorn/No Irish stuff, no Scotch over worn/Lasses in Beaver coats come away/Ye shall be welcome to us night and day.”<sup>40</sup> Morton was arrested and sent back to England at least three times over the period 1628-1637. He kept coming back, and along the way wrote the three books or long chapters of the *New English Canaan*, the first two being a cultural-geographic catalogue of Novanglian peoples, natural resources, crops, social practices, etc., with the third section being the pointed critique of Puritan/Pilgrim interaction with the natives.

Thomas Morton was probably the first and best example of a writerly Novanglian aesthetic. Morton, like Bradstreet, knew intimately that to challenge a Puritan culture would mean to write about it. Maybe this is why Bradstreet was so careful in what she did not write about (i.e. Anne Hutchinson), and maybe why Anne Hutchinson wrote nothing at all. Cohen says that the “control of literacy, and by extension the parameters of interpretation, . . . was seen as essential to the survival of the *city on a hill*.”<sup>41</sup>

Morton’s “work” at Ma-remount coincided chronologically and culturally almost exactly with that of both Roger Williams, ultra-Separatist; and with Anne Hutchinson, anti-nomian (ca. mid-1630’s). Although Bradstreet does not write a single line on Morton, Williams, or Hutchinson, we can assume with great certainty that she was privy to their dramas. She was informed about Morton’s scandal, and Williams’s radicalism, and Hutchinson’s heresy due to that fact that her father was a Deputy Governor and her husband was a member of the Court of Assistants, both of whom were required by their leadership roles to be present and vote on the fates of colonial rule-breakers and boat-

---

<sup>40</sup> Jehlen and Warner, 173.

<sup>41</sup> Cohen, 6.

rockers. She simply chose a higher course and kept her writing within the public or occasional poetry tradition, not modernizing it to include local or current events. Furthermore, if Morton was teaching the Natives with his improper poems, then Bradstreet surely could have been teaching her own and her community's children with her very proper poems. Education and the teaching of English to Natives would have been an Anglican partisan priority for Morton, so as to embed himself further and garner allies, just as literacy for Bible reading and for secular Humanities knowledge would have been, and was, a priority and a requirement for Bradstreet. Maybe her early poems are so controlled because they are a reaction to Morton's free-wheeling Classics, his "high ironic style."<sup>42</sup>

Another issue regarding Thomas Morton as it relates to Anne Bradstreet is more applicable to the education theme, in that, before the Court of Assistants-sanctioned *New England Primer* (1687), there was no theocratically sanctioned school text or catechism. Morton<sup>43</sup> mentions variously his approval for and use of the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*, which to the Puritans and Separatists alike, was a much-loathed, canonical prayer and catechetical text, which had been shoved down their throats and placed in their pews by the Church of England in the sixteenth century. It represented the Crown's version of,

---

<sup>42</sup> Cohen, 6.

<sup>43</sup> Two hundred years after Morton's raw actions and testy book, Nathaniel Hawthorne re-examined their meaning in his own short story, "The Maypole of Merry Mount" (1835). It is through Hawthorne that most American readers first encounter Puritans, especially in *The Scarlet Letter* (1850). While Hawthorne's story does not contain the person of a Thomas Morton, it does have a character called "Capt. Endicott," who was a real person (a governor and leader) in the Plymouth settlement. Endicott, upon orders from William Bradford, cut down the Maypole and ended the career of the "Lord of Misrule"; Hawthorne describes the Pilgrim-Puritans this way: "Two hundred years ago and more, the old world and its inhabitants became mutually weary of each other. Men voyaged by thousands to the west; some to barter glass beads [wampum] and such like jewels, for the furs of the Indian hunter; some to conquer virgin empires; and one stern band to pray." I include Hawthorne because no discussion of the enormous cultural radiation of the Puritan experience would be complete without him.

and limitations to, prayer. In the forty-five years between the 1642 mandatory literacy law and the 1687 primer, surely Bradstreet's quaternions and other occasional pieces fit the bill for use as secular pedagogy. But why did it take Massachusetts Bay Colony Puritan writing community so long to come up with a child's textbook? Maybe because they were so concerned that they would again be limited in worship by a kind of "Book of Common Prayer" formula. According to Cohen, "the Book of Common Prayer conveyed as much cultural power as religious power."<sup>44</sup> For the Massachusetts Bay Colony writing and preaching leaders, a school text was a problematic project.

Roger Williams's own experience with the Pilgrims and Puritans of Plymouth and Salem, Massachusetts also deserves our attention in regard to print culture and in comparison to both Thomas Morton and Anne Bradstreet. Morton was an Anglican, Bradstreet, a non-Separating Congregationalist, while Williams was a true Separatist. Each wrote to appeal to a limited niche readership: Morton's *New English Canaan*, formally printed in Amsterdam (1637) and later in London, was designed to deride the Puritan cause, and to imply Puritan religious and political treason, while featuring the Natives as Innocents in an unspoiled New Eden. Bradstreet's *Tenth Muse* (1650), also printed in London, was designed to attach Bradstreet and her cadre to to an older, more moderate Elizabethan Protestantism. Roger Williams's *Bloudy Tenant of Persecution* (1644), also published in London via John Milton's printer, was designed to carve out clearly Williams's position on religious tolerance, proselytizing, and property ownership in the Colonies, in the very glaring light of religious terrorism in Old England. According

---

<sup>44</sup> Cohen, 8.

to Williams's biographer Edwin Gaustad:

In mid July 1644, Roger Williams published *The Bloudy Tenant of Persecution for the Cause of Conscience*. It has become his most famous book – more from quoting the title [or, from its equally famous prefatory image, “If Jesus Christ were present here at London, . . .”] -- than from a reading of the contents, for it is a messy book. Williams acknowledged its roughness when he later explained that these ‘meditations’ were prepared for the printer while he was on the move, ‘in change of rooms’ in London.”<sup>45</sup>

Here again we see the awareness of an English writer in the earliest transatlantic age. For Williams, his haste was based upon the exigencies of his perilous political status, exiled from Massachussetts Bay and Plymouth, yet previously an exile from London itself, all for the “cause of conscience,” in which he ultimately prevailed in Providence, Rhode Island. The life of Roger Williams, in context of this dissertation, could provide a whole other chapter. Williams’ writing and life experiences were the polar opposites of Bradstreet’s. Yet they co-existed. Years after Anne Bradstreet was dead, and Williams had established himself and his Baptist Church in Providence, he was sought as a Narragansett translator and negotiator by the English colonists during King Phillip’s War (1675-6). In May 1682, Williams wrote to then governor Simon Bradstreet, requesting assistance in the printing of some 22 sermons that he preached to the “‘scattered English’” in the Rhode Island countryside. “Williams had told the governor that ‘there was no controversy in them,’ and that he was ‘old and weak and bruised [with] lameness

---

<sup>45</sup> Edwin Gaustad, *Liberty of Conscience: Roger Williams in America* (Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1999), 69.

in both my feet.’’<sup>46</sup> The sermons were never published.

Bradstreet does not comment on either Morton or Williams, but must have known of both, again as we are discussing a small, closed enclave of founders, over which her father and husband governed. Williams arrived on the *Lyon* in early 1631; the *Lyon* was one of the original clutch of ships sailing with the *Arbella* in 1630, but was sent back in the summer of 1630 for supplies. Morton in his day was simply infamous; all of the transatlantic community knew of him. Thus, Morton, Williams, and Bradstreet, for me, form a triumvirate of the three main strands of New English theocratic and aesthetic experience: Morton, the righteous Anglican provocateur; Williams, the near-mystic Separatist; Bradstreet, the voice of conventional, Old English moderate Protestantism. These strands were not compatible, as we can see in Philip Gura’s important book, *A Glimpse of Sion’s Glory: Puritan Radicalism in New England 1620-1660* (1984), which challenges Perry Miller’s treatment of the Early American Literature canon as having cultural solidarity. Gura’s reading is clearly in contrast to Miller’s, yet Miller’s attention to the Early American literary texts was in itself academically revolutionary, and should not be underestimated. Nevertheless, according to Gura’s study, “the sheer intellectual vigor of Miller’s *narrative* [emphasis mine]” has provided for us at least a foundational study of our field. But,

In the two decades since Miller’s death, it has become all too clear that the “liberty” he took of treating the whole literature as though it were the product of a single intelligence reveals more about his desire for order than it does of the full [cultural] complexity of

---

<sup>46</sup> Gaustad, 192.

the *New England Mind* in the 17th century. . . . Miller viewed New English dissent as a [mere] side-show to the events on the main stage of New England's intellectual and social history.<sup>47</sup>

Perry Miller as literary historian and editor has been an inexorable force in shaping the field; his literary criticism is almost entirely historically contextualized. With Miller, the literary-ness of the field is less important than the evidence which it provides for a certain consistent *story* of the New English experience. Miller's work with "the sources" is as selective and manipulative as was Ellis's treatment of Bradstreet's manuscripts. For instance, in one later anthology, Miller chose to include Rev. John Williams' captivity narration, instead of Mary Rowlandson's.

Miller's work is also old school in that he would reject the notion that Bradstreet herself rejected a Novanglian aesthetic because in her poems, she did not write about, nor in the style of, Thomas Morton or Roger Williams. Miller grouped writers according to when and where they wrote, and not about what they wrote. In other words, Morton, Bradstreet, and Williams are all the same in that they all wrote in the early to mid seventeenth century, and they all wrote in New England. The simple situation of time and place make them comrades in writing; however, as we have seen, each writes about, and ignores writing about in the case of Bradstreet, certain themes. Each used different writing styles and covered vastly different content. Morton and Williams were Novanglian; Bradstreet wrote for public, practical, and educational purposes, at least in the 1642 Manuscript and in the 1650 *Tenth Muse*.

---

<sup>47</sup> Philip Gura, *A Glimpse of Zion's Glory* (Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan U P, 1984), 6.

Finally, for an *avant-garde* approach to the field and culture in which Bradstreet is placed, one could follow the advice of Jorge Luis Borges in *Labyrinths* (1962), in his essay “Pierre Menard, Author of the *Quixote*,” in which Borges writes about Menard who has supposedly re-written, or rather, written anew, the actual *Don Quijote* by Miguel de Cervantes (1601). Using the “theme of total identification with an author,” Menard “did not want to compose another *Quixote* -- which is easy -- but *the Quixote itself*.”<sup>48</sup> I am including this theoretical idea in order to point out that my own theory, one in which I have indeed attempted a sort of “total identification” with the author, Anne Bradstreet, I have been able to reason that her own, early New English experience was not very emblematic of that culture, if by that culture we mean “Puritan” and/or “novanglian.” She wrote her poems to teach them in a public sphere dame school; the textual differences in the four editions point to cultural differences and public applications, as well.

In summary, the 1642 Manuscript, the 1650 *Tenth Muse*, and the 1678 *Several Poems* were all of an evolving, textual, cultural piece. However, it was the work of John Harvard Ellis with the Andover Manuscripts that changed our view of Bradstreet from being a poet only for her paternal readership, to being poet only to Old England, to becoming a minor public but major private poet, to a multi-faceted pedagogical, occasional, religious, and personal poet and writer.

---

<sup>48</sup> Jorge Luis Borges, “Pierre Menard, Author of the Quixote.” *Labyrinths*. (New York: New Directions, 1962), 39.