

# Introduction

---

## *The Other Voice*

In July 1650, a small volume of poems appeared for purchase in London with the extravagant title, *The Tenth Muse Lately Sprung Up in America*. Its author Anne Bradstreet (ca. 1612–1672), over three thousand miles away in the Massachusetts Bay Colony’s settlement at Andover, was apparently unaware of this event. Manuscript copies of her poems had traveled to England in 1647 when her brother-in-law John Woodbridge, a clergyman, had returned there. She very likely knew that he had these copies. Bradstreet, members of her extended family, and others in her social circle wrote and exchanged verse, participating in what is now called “social authorship.” Margaret Ezell, in her volume of Anne Killigrew’s poems prepared for the Other Voice series, defines this practice as “the serious pursuit of literary excellence shared with a select audience of readers using the medium of circulating handwritten copies.”<sup>1</sup> Thus, a writer could ensure that readers of his or her work were like-minded individuals with the education and sophistication to appreciate it. The exchange of poems created a sense of intellectual community and sustained relationships across distance.<sup>2</sup> The first poem by Bradstreet in *The Tenth Muse* is addressed explicitly to her father and cites his own poetic accomplishments as the incentive for her efforts. This poem may have served as the cover letter for a formal manuscript collection created for him: a presentation copy.

In England during the decades before the publication of *The Tenth Muse*, lyric poetry continued to circulate in manuscript copies in controlled social circles. University-educated men did publish volumes of poems on historical or religious subjects, translations of longer works, and shorter original poems flattering the king or other important personages. Some of these works would position a man for patronage or employment. Poetry by multiple authors might appear in a memorial volume, such as the 1638 collection *Justa Edouardo King*, which contains Milton’s “Lycidas.” But it was still the norm among persons of social standing to circulate their work in manuscript only, with the poems perhaps appearing in print after their deaths through the efforts of friends. The poems of writers like

1. Margaret J. M. Ezell, introduction to “My Rare Wit Killing Sin”: *Poems of a Restoration Courtier* (Toronto: Iter Inc. & Center for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2013), 32.

2. For extended discussions of the practice of manuscript exchange and its social benefits, see Margaret J. M. Ezell, *Social Authorship and the Advent of Print* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999), and Margaret Hannay, “The Countess of Pembroke’s Agency in Print and Scribal Culture,” in *Women’s Writing and the Circulation of Ideas: Manuscript Publication in England, 1550–1800*, ed. George Justice and Nathan Tinker (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 17–49.

## 2 Introduction

John Donne, George Herbert, and Thomas Carew were made public in this way. By 1650, publication patterns were beginning to change, as poetry was recruited into the national conversation about what it meant to be English, created out of the conflict between Parliament and the king. A Royalist printer, Humphrey Moseley, had begun printing editions of poems by living authors to promote a sense of national pride in the monarchy and the established Church.<sup>3</sup> Woodbridge chose to place Bradstreet's volume with Stephen Bowtell, who produced works by writers favoring Parliament and Nonconformists.<sup>4</sup> Publishing *The Tenth Muse* with Bowtell positioned Bradstreet's collection, with its poems praising Queen Elizabeth and the Protestant writers Sir Philip Sidney and Guillaume de Saluste Du Bartas (commonly referred to as Du Bartas), and its "Dialogue between Old England and New," as a political contribution to that national debate.<sup>5</sup>

When the volume did arrive in Massachusetts Bay, its author responded exactly as her brother-in-law had anticipated. He wrote in the prefatory epistle,

I fear the displeasure of no person in the publishing of these Poems but the Author's, without whose knowledge, and contrary to her expectation, I have presumed to bring to public view what she resolved should never in such a manner see the Sun.

Bradstreet did express that displeasure, in a poem known as "The Author to Her Book" that was published posthumously in a volume titled *Several Poems* (1678)—six years after her death and twenty-eight years after the publication of *The Tenth Muse*. We know from that poem that Bradstreet continued to revise the poems already printed in *The Tenth Muse* and, from a small lyric titled "An

3. Robert Wilcher, "Humphrey Moseley (b. in or before 1603, d. 1661)," *ODNB*. For an extended discussion of Moseley's project, see David Scott Kasten, "Humphrey Moseley and the Invention of English Literature," in *Agents of Change: Print Culture Studies after Elizabeth Eisenstein*, ed. Sabrina Alcorn Baron and Eric N. Lindquist (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2007), 105–24.

4. Woodbridge had connections to Bowtell through Nathaniel Ward, whose prose work *A Simple Cobbler of Agawam* Bowtell had published under a pseudonym in 1647 and who had, like Woodbridge, emigrated to Massachusetts Bay Colony in 1634 and returned to England in 1647. See Mary Rhinelander McCall, "Nathaniel Ward (c. 1578–1652)." Ward was the minister of the church in Ipswich for only two years (1634–1636) but remained in Ipswich until his return to England. The Bradstreets lived in Ipswich from 1635 to 1645.

5. For arguments about the possible political positioning of this volume, see Catherine Gray, *Women Writers and Public Debate in Seventeenth-century Britain* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 143–82, and Gillian Wright, *Producing Women's Poetry, 1600–1730* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 57–73. For an argument that highlights the Dudley family's desire to showcase daughter Anne's respectability to counter the scandal of their daughter Sarah's public prophesying, see Ivy Schweitzer, *The Work of Self-Representation: Lyric Poetry in Colonial New England* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991), 145–53.

Apology” elsewhere in *Several Poems*, that she tried, unsuccessfully, to extend her poem on the Roman monarchy. She also wrote other poems in a variety of forms, and she lost manuscripts when her house “fell prey to th’ raging fire” (“Apology,” 14). But there is no evidence that she was revising for print publication or that she sought to produce an improved printed volume of her poems.

“The Author to Her Book” asserts that she had not wanted her work to appear in print: “my blushing was not small / My rambling brat (in print) should mother call” (8). Bradstreet’s actions seem to corroborate her claim. She lived for twenty-two more years. She continued to circulate her work in manuscript. The new material presented in the posthumous volume includes five public poems: “The Author to Her Book,” two poems commemorating her parents upon their deaths, a poetic meditation called “Contemplations,” and a dialogue between “The Flesh and the Spirit.” These she would have shared among her friends and acquaintances. The other newly printed poems address private subjects: her love for her husband and her grief for the deaths of grandchildren and for the loss of the children’s mother, her daughter-in-law. The editorial comment preceding these poems states an explicit understanding, and violation, of her wishes: “*Several other Poems made by the Author upon Divers Occasions were found among her Papers after her Death, which she never meant should come to public view; amongst which, these following (at the desire of some friends that knew her well) are here inserted.*” These poems would have circulated more narrowly: the elegies primarily within the family, the love poems enclosed in letters to her husband when he was traveling.

It is an astonishing stroke of luck that we have any of Bradstreet’s poetry. Only one short piece of her father’s poetic output remains, even though he was one of the founding fathers of the Massachusetts Bay Colony and so the sort of person whose papers might be expected to survive. We know of poems by other famous individuals—Sir Philip Sidney, for example—that were praised by contemporaries but then lost because they existed in manuscript form only.<sup>6</sup> As one of the few English-language poets from colonial America whose work got into print, Bradstreet has always been part of literary history, her poems included in anthologies and taught in courses. But Bradstreet’s public work survives because her brother-in-law betrayed her trust, and the personal poems because later editors did so as well. From the start, her poems were published for purposes other than her own. Over time, her work has been presented, often piecemeal, to confirm one idea or another about what a female poet of her time and place ought to care about, write about, and sound like. This volume, by presenting all her writing that has survived, by making it clear what appeared when and where, and

6. For details of manuscript materials gone astray see Hannay, “The Countess of Pembroke’s Agency,” 27–32.

by providing explanatory notes, will allow readers to engage with the depth of her humanistic learning and the complexity of her art.

### *The Cover Image for the Present Volume*

Because no portrait of Anne Bradstreet exists, we have chosen a portrait by the English painter William Dobson (ca. 1610–1646) of a young family, tentatively identified as that of Richard Streatfeild (ca. 1611–1676).<sup>7</sup> The painting, dated about 1645, is part of the collection at the Yale Center for British Art. In 1645, Richard Streatfeild would have been thirty-four; Simon Bradstreet, born in 1603, forty-two; Anne, born about 1612, thirty-three.

The clothing worn by the Streatfeild family suggests that they are of the same social class as the Bradstreets. The woman in the portrait radiates intelligence and confidence. Her cap and collar are crisply white but otherwise unostentatious; her features are regular and pleasing. Although Anne Bradstreet contracted smallpox in her teens, her brother-in-law John Woodbridge compliments her appearance in his dedicatory poem: “There needs no painting to that comely face / That in its native beauty hath such grace.” He knew her well. There is no reason to suspect that she would be gratified by empty flattery—and if her face had been disfigured by scars, such a couplet would be egregious and cruel.

### *Anne Bradstreet’s Historical and Religious Context*

Anne Bradstreet was born and raised in England but moved with her extended family to the newly formed Massachusetts Bay Colony in 1630, when she was about eighteen years old and recently married. Not quite a century before the family left England, the Anglican church had split from Rome because of King Henry VIII’s need to produce a legitimate male heir. That church had become a confirmed independent organization with the coronation of Henry’s daughter Elizabeth, whose Protestantism was as much pragmatic as theological: She could be monarch only if her father’s second marriage, which took place during his first wife’s life, was legitimate. But the reformation of the church—both its theology and its practice—continued to be a contested issue well into the seventeenth century, with theological positions and concerns about practice intertwined.

The Anglican church officially espoused Protestant positions. Its statement of belief, published in 1563 as *Articles, whereupon it was agreed by the archbishops and bishops of both the provinces, and the whole clergy* (commonly called The Thirty-Nine Articles), codified Calvinist positions, such as the belief in

7. Katherine Gibson, “William Dobson (bap. 1611, d. 1646),” *ODNB*. For further information about Dobson and his painting, see [https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:William\\_Dobson,\\_Portrait\\_of\\_a\\_Family,\\_Probably\\_that\\_of\\_Richard\\_Streatfeild\\_\(c.\\_1645,\\_Yale\\_Center\\_for\\_British\\_Art\).jpg](https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:William_Dobson,_Portrait_of_a_Family,_Probably_that_of_Richard_Streatfeild_(c._1645,_Yale_Center_for_British_Art).jpg)

predestination (Article 17) and justification by faith alone (Article 11). The document asserts the principle that “Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation” (Article 6) and that church services must be conducted in a language that the congregation can understand (Article 24). The Book of Common Prayer (first published in 1549) made it possible for individuals to follow along with the liturgy and to pause over places in the text. A series of translations of the Bible into English—the Great Bible (1539), the Geneva Bible (1560), the Bishops’ Bible (1569), and finally, the King James Bible (1611)—ensured that individuals had access to Scripture.

But the entanglement of church and state meant that Anglican reform did not extend to church organization: The church hierarchy continued to ordain priests and assign them to particular parishes. The elaborate vestments, stained glass, incense, and music of Catholic practice continued to compete for worshippers’ attention with Scripture readings and preaching. Laypeople were expected to attend the church nearest to them. In fact, church attendance was required of all. Now that the monarch was head of the church, absence from services could be interpreted as a form of political rebellion and, potentially, treason; unexcused absences incurred serious fines.

Many English people desired more sweeping reforms in church governance and practice. The most extreme groups rejected institutional hierarchy altogether, believing that Christ alone is the head of the church in this world and the next. They wanted to worship in congregations that were “gathered,” meaning that individuals would meet in groups of like-minded people, no matter the geographical distance. Individuals should attend churches that fit their theological beliefs. Congregations should elect their own ministers and teachers and be able to fire them. The English congregation that came to be known as the Pilgrims and settled in Plymouth on Cape Cod operated in this way. For them, it mattered intensely whom a person worshipped with: Not only were conspicuously sinful people excluded but individuals, male and female, had also to apply for membership and to explain their religious beliefs and spiritual history to the congregation. Their refusal to be part of the larger Anglican Communion earned them and others like them the epithet “Separatists.”

The men who formed the Massachusetts Bay Company held many positions in common with Separatists but hoped to remain within the Anglican Communion. They favored a looser form of church governance, with more local control over the conduct of services that would focus on preaching over liturgy and other ritual practices. Most importantly, they subscribed strongly to a belief in England—and in the English church—as the leader of a militant Protestantism that would reform Europe. The ascension of the Stuart monarchs challenged this self-conception and made their position in England increasingly uncomfortable.

Although James had been raised a Protestant, he was autocratic, committed to central rule of the country and the church, and often put political considerations over religious ones. He tolerated Catholics who would swear an oath of allegiance to the king over the Pope and used his authority as both monarch and head of the Anglican church to promote a more relaxed attitude toward the Sabbath—and as a consequence toward religious observance generally—going so far as to issue in 1618 a proclamation called *The Declaration of Sports* that encouraged Sunday recreation. Far from assuming the mantle of champion of Protestantism in Europe, James proposed an alliance with Catholic Spain through a marriage between his son Charles and the Spanish Infanta Maria Anna. Despite Parliamentary intercessions, perhaps even in defiance of them, when the Spanish match failed, Charles pursued an alliance with France and, immediately after James's death in 1625, Charles married the French princess Henrietta Maria, a Catholic.

Like his father, Charles believed ardently in the divine right of kings and behaved autocratically, dissolving his Parliaments almost as soon as he called them. He expressed his high church leanings in his support of Richard Montagu, a controversialist who argued against the Calvinist idea of predestination, and William Laud, whom he appointed Dean of the Chapel Royal in 1626 and Bishop of London in 1628 and who would become the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1633. Laud championed liturgical uniformity and a focus on sacraments rather than preaching, and he employed informants and enforcers to see that clergy cooperated.

In September 1626, Charles needed money to assist the king of Denmark in his war against Ferdinand II, but Parliament was the vehicle by which the monarchy could tax its people, and Charles did not want to call a Parliament: His experiences working with that body had not been productive, and Laud had convinced him that Parliament tended toward Puritanism and was therefore anti-monarchical. In consultation with his privy council, Charles at first requested gifts of money—called “benevolences”—from individuals normally assessed for tax purposes, such as landowners, aristocrats, knights, and justices of the peace. When these gifts proved to be less than adequate for his financial needs, he required a “loan.” Individuals resisting the forced loan were subject to military service, house arrest, or prison.<sup>8</sup> Among such resisters were the fourth Earl of Lincoln, Theophilus Fiennes-Clinton, his father-in-law William Fiennes (Lord Saye and Sele), and Thomas Dudley, who was the earl's steward and Anne Bradstreet's father.<sup>9</sup> As a result of his defiance, and to set an example for other

8. For detailed discussions of the forced loan, see Richard Cust, “Charles I, the Privy Council, and the Forced Loan,” *Journal of British Studies* 24, no. 2 (April 1985): 208–35; and David Cressy, *Charles I and the People of England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 96–103.

9. David L. Smith, “William Fiennes, first viscount Saye and Sele (1582–1662),” *ODNB*; Francis J. Bremer, “Thomas Dudley (1576–31 July 1633),” *ANB*. There is no entry for Theophilus Clinton (ca. 1600–1667).

powerful men, the Crown imprisoned the Earl of Lincoln in the Tower of London from March 1627 until early in 1628.<sup>10</sup>

### *The Massachusetts Bay Colony*

The Massachusetts Bay Colony arose out of the confluence of this religious and political contention and general English economic ventures in the New World. According to Bradstreet's father, "about the Year 1627, some Friends being together in Lincolnshire, fell into discourse about New England, and the Planting of the Gospel there; and after some deliberation, we imparted our reasons, by Letters and Messages, to some in London and the West Country."<sup>11</sup> The men in the west were members of the Dorchester Company, whose projects in the New World had been unsuccessful. John Humphreys, who was married to Lady Susan Clinton, the sister of the Earl of Lincoln, was that group's treasurer.<sup>12</sup> Another Clinton relative—Isaac Johnson,<sup>13</sup> husband of the earl's sister Lady Arbella—recruited John Winthrop, who would become the Massachusetts Bay Colony's first governor, at the festivities following Cambridge University's commencement ceremony in July 1629.<sup>14</sup>

This new group of men formed the Massachusetts Bay Company, a joint stock company overseen by a board of governors, securing both a patent and a royal charter to allow them to settle and govern the land "which lies and extends between a great River there commonly called Monomack alias Merrimack, and a certain other River there, called Charles River, being in the Bottom of a certain Bay there, commonly called Massachusetts."<sup>15</sup> To encourage a significant number of gentlemen of substance to emigrate, the Massachusetts Bay Company's board

10. Francis J. Bremer, *First Founders: American Puritans and Puritanism in an Atlantic World* (Durham: University of New Hampshire Press, 2012), 66.

11. Thomas Dudley, "To the Right Honorable, My Very Good Lady, the Lady Bridget, Countess of Lincoln," in *Massachusetts; or, the First Planters of New-England* (Boston, MA: 1696), 11.

12. Francis J. Bremer, *John Winthrop: America's Forgotten Founding Father* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 152.

13. Roger Thompson, "Isaac Johnson (bap. 1601, d. 1630)," *ODNB*.

14. Bremer, *First Founders*, 147. See also Bremer, "John Winthrop (1588–1649)," *ODNB*; Charles Cohen, "John Winthrop (12 Jan. 1588–26 Mar. 1649)," *ANB*. A substantial number of the men involved in the initial migration, as well as the clergy who followed thereafter, were graduates of Emanuel College, Cambridge, including Anne's husband, Simon Bradstreet; John Cotton, minister of the church the Dudley family attended in England; John Harvard; Thomas Hooker, minister of the church the Bradstreets attended in Cambridge, Massachusetts Bay; John Rogers; Thomas Shepard; Nathaniel Ward, minister of the church the Bradstreets attended in Ipswich, Massachusetts Bay; and John Wilson.

15. The First Charter of Massachusetts, March 4, 1629, in Henry Steele Commager, *Documents of American History* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1958), 16–18.

of governors approved a document referred to as the Cambridge Agreement that transferred government of the Massachusetts Bay Colony to twelve men who promised to leave for the New World with their families the following winter. Anne Bradstreet's father, Thomas Dudley, was one of them.<sup>16</sup> The emigrants chose John Winthrop for their first governor and, after another man found he would not be able to liquidate his estates in time to leave with the group, Thomas Dudley as the deputy governor. For their own security, they took the charter with them when they set sail, making it difficult for either the stock company's governors or for the Crown to rescind their consent.

The colonists chose emigration to New England, rather than to Holland or some other Puritan-friendly country, because it would allow them, in effect, a blank slate in which to establish a model Christian commonwealth and because the New England coast had become familiar, even if still wild and in some ways forbidding. Although English contact with the North Atlantic coast of the Americas began officially in 1497, when John Cabot undertook a voyage commissioned by Henry VII, fisherman from the city of Bristol, the home port for Cabot's voyages, had likely been fishing the Outer Banks before this time.<sup>17</sup> English exploration of what is now the New England coast began in earnest in the early seventeenth century, with regular expeditions sponsored by joint-stock companies: Bartholomew Gosnold led one on behalf of the Virginia Company (1602); Matthew Pring, one underwritten by a group of Bristol merchants (1603); and George Weymouth, one supported by the East India Company (1605).<sup>18</sup> French explorers and traders, focused mainly along the St. Lawrence and the Maine/Maritime coast, and Dutch settlers, focused mainly in southern New England and what is now New York, added to European familiarity with north Atlantic coastal topography and economic prospects. By the 1620s, there were several English settlements in Massachusetts: the Separatist community at Plymouth (1620) on Cape Cod; a fur-trading post at Mount Wollaston (1624), now Quincy; and toward the end of the decade, a handful of other small economic outposts in the Bay area. The English had enough knowledge of New England by 1630 to consider establishing a substantial colony there practicable, but before the Bay Company began sending over settlers, the number of Europeans living in Massachusetts numbered only around five hundred.<sup>19</sup>

16. The Cambridge Agreement, August 26, 1629, in Commager, *Documents of American History*, 18.

17. Neal Salisbury, *Manitou and Providence: Indians, Europeans, and the Making of New England, 1500–1643* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 51.

18. Kathleen J. Bragdon, *Native People of Southern New England, 1500–1650* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1996), 5.

19. Bragdon, *Native People of Southern New England, 1500–1650*, 28.



The Native American population of southeastern New England had been substantially larger, estimated at between 75,000 and 140,000,<sup>20</sup> but two epidemics in the early seventeenth century depopulated many coastal villages and seriously destabilized the intra-tribal political situation. Between 1616 and 1618, an undetermined sickness devastated the groups most actively trading with the French, which were the ones closest to the coast.<sup>21</sup> As a result, when English colonists arrived in the 1620s and 1630s, they were able to occupy land without significant resistance. Then, in 1633, an outbreak of smallpox ravaged the remaining local villages. It spread through settlements along the Connecticut River as well, because the native population had no resistance to European pathogens. As much as 90 percent of the aboriginal population was killed off by these epidemics.

The Native Americans in southern New England practiced intensive cultivation of small garden plots, growing multiple crops in one crowded space, which provided natural supports for climbing vines, such as beans, and fixed nitrogen in the soil. Because they moved with the seasons to take advantage of varying food sources, their housing was portable. They set controlled fires in the woodlands to encourage browse for deer and to enable easy passage and good sight lines for hunters.<sup>22</sup> The settler Edward Johnson describes the woodlands in the 1630s as “thin of Timber, like our Parks in England.”<sup>23</sup> The Massachusetts Bay colonists benefited from arriving in land that had been managed for centuries, with abandoned garden plots and cleared meadows surrounding seasonal village sites. For most English settlers, however, European assumptions about land management blinded them to their good fortune: They did not recognize that this land had already been cultivated. Additionally, fifteen years had passed between the first outbreaks of disease in the local tribes and the arrival in 1630 of significant numbers of settlers,<sup>24</sup> meaning that in many places gardens and villages had gone to weeds and forest undergrowth had swelled to thicket.

The Cambridge Agreement had given the day-to-day governance of the new colony to the stockholders who had agreed to emigrate. As governor, John

20. Joseph Conforti, *Saints and Strangers: New England in British North America* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006), 6.

21. Salisbury, *Manitou and Providence*, 101; see also Conforti, *Saints and Strangers*, 26; Bragdon, *Native People*, 25–28.

22. For further information about Native American cultural practices, see Salisbury, *Manitou and Providence*, 30–48; William Cronon, *Changes in the Land: Indians, Colonists, and the Ecology of New England* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1983), 19–107; Bragdon, *Native People*, 102–29; and Conforti, *Saints and Strangers*, 6–10.

23. Edward Johnson, *A History of New England from the English planting in the year 1628 until the year 1652* (London: Printed for Nathaniel Brooke, 1653), 56. Mason I. Lowance, Jr., “Edward Johnson (Sept. 1599–23 Apr. 1672),” *ANB*.

24. Salisbury, *Manitou and Providence*, 184. For extended discussions of Native American land management practices, see Cronon, *Changes in the Land*, 34–53, and Bragdon, *Native People*, 123–29.

Winthrop outlined his idea of the ideal Christian commonwealth that the group could establish in his shipboard address, “A Model of Christian Charity.” He explained that, as fellow members of Christ’s mystical body, the colonists should treat one another with divinely required love, subordinating the needs of the individual to the success of the group. He argued that they were chosen by God for the special work of establishing this colony, that God had entered into a covenant to support them in this enterprise, and that the Massachusetts Bay Colony would be “as a city upon a hill. The eyes of all people are upon us.”<sup>25</sup> But seven hundred-plus people divided among multiple nascent townships could not easily function as one large loving family. Almost immediately, in October 1630, the General Court (the governor and the other men named in the Cambridge Agreement) extended the franchise to all propertied adult men in the colony, but those freemen had first to be church members. Church membership required testifying to having experienced a conversion experience, and doing so in a way that convinced those already part of the church that the experience was genuine. After a few bumpy years of demands from the freemen and resistance from the governors, the colony established a working government with limited representation, especially in relation to taxation. For the remainder of his life, Anne Bradstreet’s father served in the colonial government, including four one-year terms as governor. Her husband, Simon, served the colony as a magistrate and, later, as the Massachusetts representative to the New England Confederation; he himself was also elected governor in 1679, seven years after Anne’s death.

Between 1630 and 1640, between fifteen and twenty thousand English colonists arrived in Massachusetts Bay.<sup>26</sup> By 1634, settlements had expanded south and west to Connecticut, at Wethersfield, Windsor, and Hartford, and by 1637 north to what is now Dover, New Hampshire. The English colonists did not recognize Native Americans as having title to land that they were apparently not using. They occupied land without consent or purchase and treated the people they encountered as subjects in their legal system. They did not adopt Native American agricultural practices or foodways but “sought to maintain cultural distinctions.”<sup>27</sup> Johnson writes about the enthusiasm in 1633 when “a small glean of Rye was brought to the Court as the first fruits of English grain, at which this poor people greatly rejoiced to see the Land would bear it.”<sup>28</sup> The colonists would be able to eat English food grown in the New World.

25. *The Journal of John Winthrop: 1630–1649* (abridged), ed. Richard S. Dunn, James Savage, and Laetitia Yeandle (Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 1996), 10.

26. Scholars continue to refine these numbers but agree about the effect of a substantial influx of English settlers into the area. Francis J. Bremer, *The Puritan Experiment: New England Society from Bradford to Edwards* (New York: St. Martin’s, 1976), 40; Conforti, *Saints and Strangers*, 33.

27. Salisbury, *Manitou and Providence*, 186.

28. Johnson, *A History of New England*, 62.

In that same year, Roger Williams began to advocate for Native American land rights and sovereignty, but the Massachusetts Bay authorities confiscated and burned a tract he had written.<sup>29</sup> Williams's activities not only threatened to unsettle the English hegemony over native populations but also threatened to highlight Massachusetts Bay's effective if not acknowledged separation from the English Crown and the Anglican Communion, as Williams also vocally espoused Separatist positions. In October 1635, he was tried for sedition and heresy, but he escaped in January to the sachem Massasoit and, in the spring of 1636, established the Providence Plantations in what is now Rhode Island, just outside the purview of the Massachusetts Bay charter. A war among tribal nations, in which the Narragansetts and Mohegans allied with the English against the Pequots, resulted in the horrific massacre of more than five hundred Pequots when colonists set fire to the village at Mystic in 1637 and to the subsequent routing of that nation. The remaining Native Americans were not in a position to challenge the now dominant English colonists until after Anne Bradstreet's death. She leaves no record of having had any encounters with the indigenous population and expresses no opinions about them.

In exiling Williams, the governors thought they had banished religious controversy, but in 1637 they faced another test in the Antinomian controversy and the trial of Anne Hutchinson.<sup>30</sup> Hutchinson had attended John Cotton's church in England, where Anne Bradstreet and her parents had worshipped, and followed Cotton to Massachusetts in 1634.<sup>31</sup> Among the Calvinists, Cotton leaned toward free grace, the idea that an individual can do nothing to constrain God to grant him salvation; most of the other clergy in Massachusetts Bay were preparationists, arguing that individuals should work with the guidance of clergymen to make themselves more likely to receive grace. Anne Hutchinson held meetings in her home to discuss sermons, which was an appropriately pious activity. She must have been both a brilliant and a charismatic teacher, because more and more women, and then some men, attended these discussions. At her trial in November 1637, she cited the scriptural command that the elder women should teach the younger (Titus 2:3–4), but she had transgressed Paul's dictum that women not "usurp authority over the man" (1 Timothy 2:12) by teaching

29. Salisbury, *Manitou and Providence*, 196. See also Glenn W. LaFantasie, "Roger Williams (1603?–1683)," *ODNB*; Francis J. Bremer, "Roger Williams (ca. 1606–1683)," *ANB*. For further information about Roger Williams's conflict with Massachusetts Bay authorities, see Edmund Morgan, *Visible Saints: The History of a Puritan Idea*, paperback reprint (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1965), 102–12.

30. Elaine C. Huber, "Anne Hutchinson (1591?–1643)," *ANB*. For further discussion, as well as the primary documents related to this crisis, see David D. Hall, *The Antinomian Controversy, 1636–1638: A Documentary History* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1990).

31. Francis J. Bremer, "John Cotton (1585–1652)," *ODNB*; Sargent Bush, Jr., "John Cotton (4 Dec. 1584–23 Dec. 1652)," *ANB*.