SMITH COLLEGE HISTORICAL REVIEW

Volume I, Issue I
Fall 2025

Smith College Historical Review
Volume I, Issue I (Fall 2025)

Table of Contents

About the Authors

Eleanor Campbell is a senior at Mount Holyoke College majoring in history and minoring in Spanish. Her studies focus on the development of the state in 19th- and 20th-century Europe and the United States. Topics of recent history papers include the progress of monarchy, republicanism, and fascism in the 19th- and 20th-century Czech Republic; liberalism, social reform, and legislation around sex workers in late 19th-century Britain; and American women's participation in the antebellum nativist movement. In her free time, she enjoys reading classic literature, singing British folk music, writing historical fiction, and petting dogs. This is her first publication, and she is grateful to her parents, friends, professors, and the *Smith College Historical Review* for their support.

Adela Hoffman graduated from Smith College in January of 2026. She grew up in the small town of Red Hook, New York, just a twenty-five-minute drive from Betty Millard's final residence near Lake Taconic. Hoffman majored in History and minored in Philosophy, the former being one of her longest academic interests and the latter a new challenge to strengthen her writing and argumentative skills. At Smith College, Hoffman spent her free time working on productions with Smith Shakes, competing for Smith's equestrian team, and serving on the Academic Honor Board. Hoffman's historical research, prior to this paper, focused on American conservatism in the 20th century. Branching out of her comfort zone, Betty Millard piqued Hoffman's interest in her final history writing seminar with Casey Bohlen due to her tenacity, rebellious nature, and anti-capitalist commitment.

Conger Wang is a fourth-year undergraduate student at the University of Edinburgh (2022–2026), pursuing an Honours degree in History. Her research interests fall in the global history of ideas generally. She has published peer-reviewed articles in *History Society x Retrospect Journal* by the University of Edinburgh and *Casopis Obscura* by the Charles University, with topics ranging from Mussolini's cult of personality to the Keynes-Hayek Debate. Conger has presented original research at multiple international conferences, including the China Work Group at KU Leuven (June 2025), the Conference on Intelligent Communication in Digital Humanities at East China Normal University (June 2025), the Cracovian Congress of History Students at Jagiellonian University (May 2025), and the online International Undergraduate History Conference hosted by the University of Maryland Global Campus (April 2025). Beyond academia, Conger has worked as an

Assistant Curator at the Southern Song Official Kiln Museum and is a professional-level pianist.

Adriana Bilenky is a senior at Dartmouth College, from East Fishkill, NY. She is a first-generation college student pursuing a History Major and a Biology Minor in hopes of attending law school after a few years of work. She is particularly interested in American working-class history, ecology, and modern Central and Eastern European history with a focus on Slovakia, where her parents are from. On campus, she is involved in the *Dartmouth Undergraduate Historical Review* (DUHR) as Editor-in-Chief, the *Dartmouth Law Journal* (DLJ) as Senior Submissions Editor, The *Dartmouth Apologia* as an Editor, as well as co-chair of the Hood Museum of Art's Museum Club. In her spare time she enjoys making jewelry, swimming, fencing and playing DnD.

Olivia Cannings is a final year undergraduate student at the University of Edinburgh studying History and Classics. Her interests lie in the literary and cultural history of Medieval and Early Modern Europe, and especially in its intersection with women's lives. She also has a keen interest in Ancient Greek and Latin literature and language, and she is the recipient of the Horsliehill-Scott Bursary in Classics and the W.R. Hardie Memorial Prize for Latin Prose Composition. She is currently working on her undergraduate dissertation entitled 'Imperialism and the Elegiac *Puella* in Ovid's *Amores*.'

Editor's Preface

On behalf of the Fall 2025 Editorial Board, I am proud to present the inaugural edition of the Smith College Historical Review, Smith's first and only student-run journal that is dedicated to publishing outstanding student scholarship in the field of history.

The first article included in the edition, by Eleanor Campbell (Mount Holyoke College), draws upon English minister John Eliot's *Indian Dialogues,* analyzing the text as a proposal for land use in 17th-century Massachusetts. Her article demonstrates how Eliot's mission provides an oft-overlooked point of entry into the English struggle for Massachusetts land. Campbell's vivid vignettes and distinctive authorial voice only add to the precision of the article; she seamlessly connects the *Indian Dialogues* to wide-sweeping historical trends.

The second article, by Adela Hoffman (Smith College), draws on the papers of Betty Millard, a member of the American Communist party from 1936 to 1956, to challenge prior historiographic appraisals of Millard which positioned her solely as a feminist rather than recognizing her efforts to rid society of all forms of social hierarchy. Hoffman's clear and commanding narrative voice questions the practice of historiography and offers a fresh and necessary exploration of Millard's life and work.

The third article, by Conger Wang (University of Edinburgh) examines the legal interactions between Tang Dynastic law and a transnational Buddhist script, the Vinaya, ultimately situating the Huichang Persecution as the culmination of a prolonged conflict between the dynastic laws and the monastic laws. Wang's impressive employment of primary sources intervenes in prior historical understandings of this period, shedding light on the legal dimensions of the persecutions of Buddhism between 840 and 846.

The fourth article, by Adriana Bilenky (Dartmouth College), explores the Czechoslovak government-in-exile's use of squadrons in its struggle for political legitimacy during the Second World War. Her article employs original archival research and succinctly utilizes relevant historiography to advance an original and relevant historical argument. Bilenky's conclusions regarding political legitimacy and symbolic independence are an important and novel contribution to the field.

In the collection's final article, Olivia Cannings (University of Edinburgh) focuses on Elizabeth I's use of gifts as a form of sociopolitical leverage in her pre-accession experience, advancing an original argument about her position in the late Henrician court. The article offers evocative, surprising and astute insights into women's status in 16th-century England

through original analysis of Elizabeth's use of (false) modesty and her manipulation of social dynamics. Cannings' precise insight into Elizabeth's subtle choices in tone and verbiage brings the texts to life.

We are excited to present a selection of exceedingly thought-provoking and original articles that span from China's Tang Dynasty to the Cold War in America, traversing continents and eras. It is our intention to highlight exceptional work from undergraduate students that offers strong and inventive historical scholarship, and we believe the selected essays do just that. We have prioritized originality of thought and argument, a clear and effective authorial voice, meticulous primary source work (which often includes original archival research), and an argument that considers and challenges existing historiography. The articles in this edition exemplify all of this and more, offering critical new ways of thinking about history.

Our small but dedicated team of editors expended considerable time and effort to make this issue a reality, including reviewing over 30 submissions in detail, as well as navigating the challenges of establishing a campus presence, overseeing outreach, publicity, and the evaluation process. I thank them, and the Smith College Department of History, for providing the conditions under which this journal could emerge. It's an honor to be a part of this team.

Sincerely,
Skylar Ball
Editor-in-Chief

"Suffer not the English to strip them of all their Lands:" John Eliot's *Indian Dialogues* as a Proposal For Land Use in 17th-Century Massachusetts

Eleanor Campbell
Mount Holyoke College

John Seller, "A mapp of New England" c.1675.
Map reproduction courtesy of the Norman B. Leventhal Map & Education Center at the Boston Public Library

Cambridge, Massachusetts Bay Colony, 1671. Marmaduke Johnson is hard at work, sweating mightily as he rolls and presses ink into the newest plate of type. From the corner comes the soft clinking of his apprentice preparing the next page, setting the finicky metal letters in place with inky fingers. He hopes the boy is doing it right, but he doesn't have time to hover over him. For the English printer is in a hurry. Though he has the newest equipment in town, the manuscript is full of broken words, upside down letters, and insufficiently-inked lines, its press run will be very small.[1] Johnson has been receiving valuable patronage from the Mather family recently, and spending time on strange promotional material for the Indians does not pay nearly as handsomely, in money or reputation.[2] As he hastily rolls the paper and type form under the wooden platen, preparing to press the words to the page, he hopes Mr. Eliot will not mind too much. He is, after all, a man of God, and knows the law of seventy-seven times seven.[3] Besides, this odd little text is meant for Indians. It is not likely to be very popular or lucrative.

The text Marmaduke Johnson seals indelibly onto paper is the latest work by prolific English minister John Eliot. With the winding title *Indian Dialogues, For Their Instruction in that great Service of Christ, in calling home their Country-men to the knowledge of God, and of Themselves, and of Jesus Christ*, it contains three vignettes of Indigenous Christians ministering to members of their non-Christian communities, ostensibly meant to serve as a textbook for training Indigenous missionaries. It was, indeed, not very successful, and largely forgotten in the shadow of Eliot's more readily intelligible and available material. It has been revived to some extent in the 20th and 21st centuries as Indigenous studies becomes a locus of study for more and more historians. Few authors, however, have examined *Indian Dialogues* on its own, nor sought to contextualize it within the larger scope of King Philip's War which followed soon on its heels. To be sure, it contains references

[1] Henry W. Boden and James P. Ronda, *John Eliot's Indian Dialogues: A Study in Cultural Interaction* (Greenwood Press, 1980), 56.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Matt 18:20–22 (King James Version).

pointing in numerous directions, making it difficult to pick apart and decipher. But this fact alone raises the question of its intended audience, and therefore why Eliot chose this moment to produce such a text.

In 1671, the world around Eliot teetered on the brink of cataclysmic violence. That year alone, the map of New England was crisscrossed by countless diplomatic missions in an attempt to stave off such an outcome. The second and third generations of colonists expanded further and further westward, claiming increasing amounts of land for their plantations, houses, churches, and pastures. This brought them into conflict with local Indigenous tribes who occupied that land. In particular, a precarious situation developed between Plymouth Colony and Metacom (known in English as King Philip), a Wampanoag leader. Philip and his followers believed they had entered into an agreement of mutual support with the colony, and that the colony had not upheld its side of the bargain—indeed, Wampanoags witnessed increased loss of land and autonomy at the hands of Plymouth and other New England colonies.[4] War with Philip was not yet inevitable, but nevertheless, it remained a distinct and ominous possibility. How did these events and points of contention reflect on Eliot's decision to pen *Indian Dialogues*? In short, *Indian Dialogues* serves as a multi-pronged pitch of Eliot's missionary project to English authorities. It provides them with a brief sketch of praying towns' operation and purpose; presents Praying Indians as loyal, theologically-sound diplomatic tools; devises logical methods of persuading Indigenous leaders; and overall offers an alternate path away from impending Anglo-Indigenous warfare through the conversion of King Philip. All these arguments have deeply-imbedded context in the land disputes which ultimately sparked King Philip's War; and through probing other texts and historical events, a picture emerges of Eliot's justification for his praying towns and their use of land in undertaking the salvation of souls—and keeping the peace.

[4] James David Drake, *King Philip's War: Civil War in New England, 1675–1676*, Native Americans of the Northeast (University of Massachusetts Press, 1999), 27–8; Bowden and Ronda, *John Eliot's Indian Dialogues*, 1.

John Eliot, 'Apostle to the Indians'

John Eliot was born in Widford, Hertfordshire in late summer of 1604. He attended Jesus College, Cambridge, and became a vicar in the Church of England. In 1631, he travelled to the Massachusetts Bay Colony, becoming a minister at Roxbury and teaching at a local school to augment his salary.[5] The vicious Pequot War of 1636-1638 followed soon after his arrival. Conflicts over European trade raged between various groups of Pequots, Mohegans, and English colonizers up and down New England. This upheaval may have inspired Eliot to undertake missionary work with local Indigenous groups.[6] In the early 1640s, he began to learn the local dialect of the Algonquian language from a servant named Cockanoe who had been captured by New England colonists during the war.[7] In 1646 Eliot made his first sermon in Algonquian to Indigenous people—a group of Massachusets near the English settlement of Dorchester.[8] While he was not well received at first, his persistence and attempts to learn the language, as well as his translations of key texts like catechisms and prayers into Algonquian, eventually gained him acceptance in some Indigenous communities.[9] Those who converted were called 'Praying Indians.'[10] By the 1650s and 60s, Eliot had become a well-established figure with a not insignificant following. He also had a steady source of funding: the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, established by Parliament in 1649, disseminated promotional material (now known as the Eliot tracts),

[5] Bowden and Ronda, *John Eliot's Indian Dialogues*, 26. The authors note that Eliot's childhood was not particularly rigorous in matters of religion; he attended Jesus College rather than the more Puritan-leaning Emmanuel College, and also became a vicar in the Anglican church rather than a Dissenting one. However, by the time of his emigration, he seems to have adopted more Puritan views, perhaps influenced by the increasingly forceful centralisation efforts of Archbishop William Laud in the lead-up to the English Civil War.
[6] Drake, *King Philip's War*, 27.
[7] "John Eliot, 'Apostle to the Indians' of New England," Jesus College, Cambridge, accessed 29 April 2025, http://www.jesus.cam.ac.uk/about-jesus-college/old-library-archives/exhibitions/john-eliot/promoting-and-propagating-the-gospel/.
[8] Bowden and Ronda, *John Eliot's Indian Dialogues*, 28; for more details of this encounter, including Eliot's recounting in his text *The Light appearing more and more towards the perfect Day* (1651), see Kristina Bross, *Dry Bones and Indian Sermons: Praying Indians in Colonial America*, (Cornell University Press, 2004), 121–3.
[9] "John Eliot, 'Apostle to the Indians' of New England."
[10] I use the term 'Praying Indians' as it is widely, if not ubiquitously, used in the scholarship and original source material, and Praying Indians (specifically among the Massachusetts, Wampanoag, and Nipmuc) would have likely used this term or an Algonquian equivalent to describe themselves. Where possible, I utilize the tribe name of specific groups; otherwise, I use the term "Indigenous Christian/non-Christian." For alternative naming practices, see: Sarah Pawlicki, "'I Hear That God Saith Work'": Wunnampuhtogig and Puritans Laboring for Grace in Massachusetts, 1643–1653," *Early American Studies, An Interdisciplinary Journal* 20, no. 2 (Spring 2022): 190–1.

written by Eliot and his colleagues, throughout England. The Society would collect donations and send them to the United Colonies of New England, which had the power to distribute them to missionaries.[11] Using this funding, Eliot pursued numerous enterprises, including publishing an Algonquian translation of the Bible, *Mamusee Wunneetapanatamwe Up-Biblum God* in 1663, and setting up praying towns, settlements separate from both English and Indigenous society where Praying Indians could live and work. He established the first praying town in Natick, Massachusetts Bay Colony in 1652. Thirteen more, of varying success, would follow around modern-day Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Connecticut. In his writings, Eliot describes praying towns as spaces providing work, communal reinforcement of piety, and progress towards 'civilisation' (and therefore true conversion) through adoption of English-style building, literacy, gender roles, labour practices, tools, and clothing.[12] However, as historian James Drake points out, these descriptions were written to officials and possible donors in hopes of securing political support and money, and may not reflect the synthesized reality of many praying town inhabitants.[13] Whatever the clash between reality and expectation, praying towns were becoming more visible, reaching their peak population—about 1,100 people—in 1674.[14] In addition, Praying Indians played a growing role in diplomatic efforts between non-Christian Indigenous people and English colonizers, especially as tensions between King Philip and English authorities increased.[15] *Indian Dialogues*, then, was produced at a moment ripe for

[11] "July 1649: An Act for the promoting and propagating the Gospel of Jesus Christ in New England," in *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum, 1642–1660*, ed. C. H. Firth and R. S. Rait, *British History Online*, accessed April 29, 2025, https://www.british-history.ac.uk/no-series/acts-ordinances-interregnum/pp197-200.
[12] Jenny Hale Pulsipher, *Subjects unto the Same King: Indians, English, and the Contest for Authority in Colonial New England*, Early American Studies (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005), 74.
[13] Drake, *King Philip's War*, 59–61. Drake further cites archaeological projects conducted by Elise Brenner at Natick in the 1980s, which found surprisingly few traces of English material culture and suggested Praying Indians at Natick adopted a blend of traditional Indigenous and English practices.
[14] Population numbers from Bowden and Ronda, *John Eliot's Indian Dialogues*, 40.
[15] For the diplomatic role of Praying Indians, see Bross, *Dry Bones*, 120–1. For the use of the name Philip, see Philip Ranlet, "Another Look at the Causes of King Philip's War," *New England Quarterly* 61, (March 1988), quoted in Drake, *King Philip's War*, 197–8. Following the work of historians James Drake, Jill Lepore, and Philip Ranlet, I have retained Philip's English name rather than using Metacom. Drake cites Ranlet's work which claims that Indigenous leaders willingly used different names, as did Philip when relations with the English were still friendly; thus using an alternate name does not accomplish a more 'Indigenous-centred' focus. It also maintains continuity with the character in *Indian Dialogues*.

addressing Anglo-Indigenous conflict and the role of Praying Indians in New England society.

Eliot opens *Indian Dialogues* with an address—a common trait of the Eliot Tracts. In this case, he writes to the Commissioners of the United Colonies of New England, setting forth his motives for writing and updating them on his missionary progress. He laments that he can find "few English Students willing to engage in so dim a Work as this", and therefore he has decided to train Indigenous missionaries to spread Christianity in their own communities. He started the experiment the previous winter, "not without good success", and he hopes to use *Indian Dialogues* as a tool for teaching more Indigenous missionaries. He also cites concrete experience and imagination as informing the proceeding dialogues. Then, he concludes with a curious supplication:

> My earnest Request unto your selves, is, That in all your respective Colonies you would take care that due Accommodation of Lands and Waters may be allowed them, whereon Townships and Churches may be (in after-Ages) able to subsist; and suffer not the English to strip them of all their Lands, in places fit for the Sustenance of the life of man.[16]

But rather than clarify his intentions, his statement produces even more questions. Why does Eliot advocate for Indigenous land ownership? Which people does he want to keep their lands – all Indigenous people, or only Praying Indians? What does the qualification "in after-Ages" signify, and why is time important? For answers, we must dissect the body of the text.

Dialogue I: English Agriculture, Spiritual Wealth

Dialogue I opens with a conversation between two characters, Kinsman and Piumbukhou. Piumbukhou may represent Piambow, the ruling elder at the praying town of Hassanamessit, or Piam Boohan, a ruling elder at Natick;[17] he may, like Kinsman, be a stock figure of Eliot's imagination. Whatever his actual basis, we learn that this character has lived

[16] Eliot, *Indian Dialogues*, i.
[17] Bowden and Ronda, *John Eliot's Indian Dialogues*, 163.

in a praying town for twenty years, and has come to visit his village in an attempt to convert his friends and relations to Christianity. He meets Kinsman at the entrance of the village. Behind them, a celebration is underway, complete with "great Dancing, and Sacrifice, and Play," and Kinsman invites Piumbukhou to join in the revelry.[18] But Piumbukhou refuses in the strongest terms, calling traditional Indigenous activities "filth and folly," "dark works," and "a deep pit and filthy puddle."[19] He has come on a proselytizing mission and not to be tempted back into his old ways. Kinsman expresses interest in his views and invites Piumbukhou back to his house to discuss them. On their way, Kinsman asks if "praying to God exempt[s] you from Sickness, Poverty, Nakedness? will praying to God fill you with food, gladness, and garments?" Questions about these basic needs—food, shelter, wellbeing—undoubtedly reflect real concerns held by Indigenous people facing starvation and deadly epidemics. Some must have felt that the English, with their seeming immunity to sickness and endless encroachment on Indigenous land, must have had a supernatural advantage on their side.[20] The query also agrees with the syncretic nature of Algonquian spirituality, in which other gods or spirits would be considered if they were thought beneficial or as maintaining good relations with the spirit world.[21] Piumbukhou responds that praying to God makes one *spiritually* rich, teaching the believer faith, obedience, and labor, and that in this way the English have gained true wealth. But Kinsman expresses his skepticism. He points out that although they have converted to English ways, Praying Indians do not have the markers of English prosperity. He asks: "where be your flocks and herds of Cattel? where be your clothes? what great Houses have you built? where be your fields of Corn, Barns and Orchards? Alas, you are not like the English; and therefore I doubt

[18] Eliot, *Indian Dialogues*, 2.
[19] Ibid., 2–3.
[20] David J. Silverman, "Indians, Missionaries, and Religious Translation: Creating Wampanoag Christianity in Seventeenth-Century Martha's Vineyard," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 62, no. 2 (2005): 151–5, https://doi.org/10.2307/3491598.
[21] Harold W. Van Lonkhuyzen, "A Reappraisal of the Praying Indians: Acculturation, Conversion, and Identity at Natick, Massachusetts, 1646–1730," *The New England Quarterly* 63, no. 3 (1990): 400; Silverman, "Indians, Missionaries, and Religious Translation," 147.

upon this point, it is not as you say, that praying to God teacheth you the right way to be rich."[22]

Piumbukhou elucidates that he means heavenly riches, and sets out a neatly numbered list of them which includes knowledge of God, knowledge of ourselves, knowledge of Jesus Christ, knowledge of the grace of God, knowledge of the means of grace, and knowledge of the afterlife. In this interaction, Kinsman provides the most telling insight: that English wealth, along with physical health and provender, inherently concerns sprawling agricultural enterprises, whereas Indigenous wealth concerns bodily comfort and happiness. While this may tell us more about Eliot's perception of wealth than any Indigenous viewpoint, it nevertheless illustrates the close tie between English prosperity and large-scale land use which pervaded the New England colonies in the 17th century.

At this juncture, the two characters arrive at Kinsman's house. There, they encounter Kinsman's wife, Kinswoman, and a group of revelers. After exchanging pleasantries with Kinswoman, Piumbukhou steers the conversation back to Christianity. He contends that Indigenous pleasures will condemn those who partake to a fiery "Prison of Hell," unless they repent and turn to God.[23] This ominous talk unsettles the listeners. Kinsman again expresses doubt, pointing out that their wise ancestors never discovered such things, and suggests that Christianity may be an English ploy to weaken Indigenous groups:

> May not we rather think that *English* men have invented these Stories to amaze and scare us out of our old Customes, and bring us to stand in awe of them, that they might wipe us of our Lands, and drive us into Corners, to seek out new wayes of living, and new places too? and be beholding to them for that which is our own, and was ours, before we knew them.[24]

The assembled company agrees with this sentiment. Piumbukhou responds with the rather weak argument that the Bible constitutes the law of God, and as such did not come about through anyone's invention. The English received the knowledge held in the Bible and

[22] Eliot, *Indian Dialogues*, 4.
[23] Ibid., 7.
[24] Ibid.

used it to advance themselves, and now offer it to Indigenous people as a resource to do likewise. Kinsman's shrewd assessment reveals that Indigenous people did not blindly hand off their lands to English colonizers, and even people not involved in leadership had the political consciousness to come to these conclusions. His concerns have a particular exigence in the context of the 1660s and 70s, when the settler population nearly doubled and demands for plantations and land for towns grew exponentially.[25] English farming methods, such as maintaining grazing pastures for livestock and horses, took up far more room than the Algonquian methods of hunting and gathering with small-scale cultivation of certain herbs and vegetables.[26] However, Piumbokhou does not directly address the tensions behind the question and instead turns it into a justification of English colonization. It remains under the surface, and neither supports nor detracts from Eliot's exhortation in his address, to "suffer not the English to strip them of their Lands."

After providing his justification for Biblical truth, Piambukhou breaks into long-winded praise of English colonizers and a sanitized timeline of their history. In this version of events, the English hear of the godlessness and "wilde condition" of the New World's inhabitants while out exploring the ocean and stop by to help them towards salvation.[27] "And being come hither," he continues, "we gave them leave freely to live among us: they have purchased of us a great part of those Lands which they possess; they love us, do us right, and no wrong willingly; if any do us wrong, it is without the consent of their Rulers, and upon our complaints our wrongs are righted."[28] The odd structure of the sentence reveals as much as it obscures. Focus remains on the English who, according to Eliot, *currently* own the land, rather than the Indigenous people who *did* own the land. Instead of claiming that "we allowed them to purchase our land from us," Piumbukhou mixes past and present tense to lay stress upon the current state of possession – the phrase gravitates

[25] Pulsipher, *Subjects unto the Same King*, 77.
[26] Bowden and Ronda, *John Eliot's Indian Dialogues*, 6–7.
[27] Eliot, *Indian Dialogues*, 8.
[28] Ibid. For details on how Indigenous leaders viewed subjection, tribute, and details of their petitions to the English monarchy, see Pulsipher's book, or her shorter article derived from the same material: Jenny Hale Pulsipher, "Subjects… Unto the Same King: New England Indians and the Use of Royal Political Power" in *Colonial America: Essays in Politics and Social Development*, ed. Stanley N. Katz et al. 6th ed. (Routledge, 2011).

towards the end of the clause. Through this framing, Piumbukhou glosses over the uncomfortable *action* of gaining land; i.e., the physical act of colonization. He names purchase as the only medium of transaction, thereby obscuring other tactics such as force and negotiation (or an ambiguous mixture of all three) used by English colonizers to gain land.[29] Eliot's motivations for this portrayal may lie in his intended audience, the New England authorities, in his attempt to gain political support for his missionary work. Presenting colonization in a positive manner, especially in the voice of an Indigenous character, might better his chances of securing this support.

As with the subsequent dialogues, Dialogue I ends with the Praying Indian successfully converting an Indigenous community and conducting a Sabbath service, complete with a small sermon or other theological instruction. In this case, Piumbukhou sets out some of the basic tenets of Puritan Christianity: the Our Father prayer, the Virgin birth, salvation through Jesus' sacrifice, irresistible grace, the Trinity. Kinsman accepts all these teachings, but brings up the fact that his community does not have sufficient training to pray or read in order to continue in the faith. But Piumbukhou has an easy solution: "I will speak unto the church at *Natick*, and we will find a wise man to teach you, to keep Sabbaths among you."[30] In the thinly-veiled medium of a dialogue, Eliot lays the groundwork for his claim that Natick (and other praying towns) play an indispensable role in conversion efforts. They not only serve as a place for Praying Indians to live away from the temptations of their previous lives, but also as a base for further missionary work. The importance of this work comes from a combination of its proselytizing potential and its physical location. In his text *A Brief Narrative of the Progress of the Gospel amongst the Indians in New England*, published the year before *Indian Dialogues*, Eliot highlights the political role of Praying Indians based on their culture as well as their geographical place. According to Kristina Bross, "he

[29] Pulsipher, *Subjects unto the Same King*, 72–3; for King Philip's sale of land, see Drake, *King Philip's War*, 62. Indigenous people, including King Philip, did indeed sell land for profit, but the freedom with which they did so is unclear, given the avalanche of pressures applied by circumstance and the English.
[30] John Eliot, *Indian Dialogues*, 24.

positions the Praying Indians in these towns as literal and spiritual hedges between the English and hostile Indians."[31] Eliot cites the work of Praying Indians maintaining garrisons against the Mohawks, as well as their diplomatic efforts between Indigenous non-Christians and the English. The literacy and familiarity with English culture gained in praying towns, combined with their fluency in Indigenous culture, makes Praying Indians the perfect means of spiritually and physically aiding the English by creating an environment no longer troubled by civic and religious divisions.[32]

But in order to create and maintain these settlements, of course, Eliot needs suitable land whereupon "Townships and Churches may be (in after-Ages) able to subsist."[33] Eliot, his colleagues, and the inhabitants of praying towns did litigate to make this a reality, particularly in the case of Natick. Natick was founded on 2,000 acres granted by the English town of Dedham. However, as Natick's population grew in the 1650s, most of the Praying Indians' homes and planting fields lay outside of the designated plot, and Eliot petitioned the colony for more space.[34] The land he chose lay along the Charles River and had rich, fertile soil. Dedham's inhabitants wanted it for grazing livestock and fiercely contested Eliot's petition. In order to secure this valuable asset, Eliot framed his request to the Massachusetts General Court as fulfilling the Lord's work of converting Indigenous people, which, in this case, could only be carried out by taking land from an English settlement. Eliot won; and though legal disputes with Dedham continued into the 1660s, the courts sided with the Praying Indians, albeit with some reservations.[35] Drake argues that Eliot's reliance on a higher moral argument resulted in his victory over Dedham's purely practical angle.[36] Eliot's success at Natick could have influenced the way he argues for praying towns in *Indian Dialogues* some twenty years later—that is, utilizing religion as a persuasive method.

[31] Bross, *Dry Bones*, 116.
[32] Ibid., 117.
[33] Ibid., 1.
[34] Pulsipher, *Subjects unto the Same King*, 74–5.
[35] Drake, *King Philip's War*, 62–3; Pulsipher, *Subjects Unto the Same King*, 76–7. In compensation, the court granted Dedham 2000 acres in the Connecticut River Valley which would later become Deerfield. Pulsipher contrasts Natick with the less successful example of Okonokhamesitt, a praying town established in 1658, which was overrun by the haphazard and rampant settlement of Marlborough beginning two years later.
[36] Drake, *King Philip's War*, 62–3.

Dialogue II: Conversion as Conservation

Dialogue II delves into a carefully structured mapping out of Calvinist ideology. The main speaker is Waban, who was one of Eliot's first converts and an important colleague in missionary work. The penitent is evidently an invention of Eliot's named Peneovot.[37] Waban leads Peneovot through a foundational lesson on Puritan Christianity, a kind of catechism in miniature, outlining the power and civil authority of God, our redemption through Christ, and the nature of the Trinity.[38] He also lays out the Five Points of Calvinism, with special attention paid to limited atonement, predestination, and irresistible grace. Peneovot accepts these ideas with surprising alacrity. He displays the Puritan "stages of spiritual progress"—revelation, feelings of intense guilt and inadequacy, eagerness to accept Christ's mercy, resolution to reform his ways—which betoken true conversion.[39] In this way, he represents the figure of Kinsman, now more advanced on the spiritual journey and ready to imbibe abstract theological concepts. Putting aside any considerations of how the format and time constraints may have influenced Eliot's writing, Peneovot's conversion strikes the reader as very unnatural and oddly accelerated. It brings up the question of why Indigenous people converted to Christianity, and why some chose to live in praying towns like Natick. While this question has preoccupied the scholarship for decades, and speculated motivations are many and varied, we can point in some part to evidence like the legal battles between Natick and Dedham for answers.

In his assessment of Natick's land grant, James Drake highlights the measure of legal security obtained by Praying Indians through property litigation. Wampanoag people had limited options at their disposal when it came to protecting their land against English encroachment, but, as Drake states, Praying Indians could pursue other, stronger methods

[37] Bowden and Ronda, *John Eliot's Indian Dialogues*, 165.
[38] Ibid., 46.
[39] Ibid., 50.

not available to Indigenous non-Christians.[40] Both Christian and non-Christian Indigenous people throughout the New England colonies "invested heavily in the English political system as a means of preserving their autonomy, and, in many cases, a land base."[41] That said, having English allies like John Eliot might greatly legitimize a case in the eyes of an English general court; adopting 'civilized' English customs, as was supposedly required in praying towns, might also have the same effect.[42] In addition, English missionaries involved in establishing praying towns seem to have acknowledged them as a means of preserving Indigenous lands. Drake cites Daniel Gookin, Eliot's colleague and successor, on praying towns' *raison d'être*:

> First, to prevent differences and contention among the English and Indians in future times about the propriety of land. Secondly, to secure unto them and their posterity places of habitation; this being a provision in all those grants, that they shall not sell or alienate any part of those lands unto any Englishman, without the general court's consent: for the Indians being poor, as well as improvident, are very prone to sell their land to the English, and thereby leave themselves destitute.[43]

Eliot and his colleagues appear to have kept true to these intentions. Their defense of Natick, undoubtedly aided by some of its Indigenous inhabitants, illustrates the possible practical benefits and opportunities borne of conversion. Land was far from the only motivator of conversion to Christianity; but if we contrast Natick with the case of King Philip, who in the 1660s opted to sell some of his lands in order to obtain currency for trade goods, one can understand why some Indigenous people may have seen conversion as a reasonable sacrifice for keeping their claims to the land.[44]

Dialogue III: A Solution for a New World

Out of all the dialogues, Dialogue III has received the most attention, mainly because of its rather fantastical inclusion of King Philip, the Wampanoag sachem. Eliot calls him

[40] Drake, *King Philip's War*, 62.
[41] Ibid., 58.
[42] Pulsipher, *Subjects Unto the Same King*, 74. Similarities in custom, appearance (clothes), literacy and language skills, and faith might have also contributed to a better reception from English authorities.
[43] Daniel Gookin, *Historical Collections of the Indians in New England* [1674], reprinted in *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, 1st ser. (1792), 179, quoted in Drake, *King Philip's War*, 62.
[44] Drake, *King Philip's War*, 62–3.

Philip Keitascott, a name which appears in other contemporary sources and perhaps derives from the Massachusett word *ketashoot* or sachem.[45] The Christians he converses with are two Indigenous missionaries: Anthony, who was a preacher at Natick, and William Ahauton, son of the chief ruler at the praying town of Ponkipog.[46] Much of the dialogue focuses on the political consequences of Indigenous conversion. Rather incredibly, Eliot puts Philip on the edge of conversion, asking insightful questions about how adopting the new faith might change his power as sachem. As unlikely as this scenario seems to modern readers, positioning Philip in this way allows Eliot to propose a method of peaceful cohabitation—or English domination—through his missionary program. By providing ready answers to his perception of the real-life Philip's concerns, Eliot perhaps hopes to reach the ears of Philip himself, or else give English authorities the persuasive tools to bring Philip to an understanding.

The dialogue opens with Anthony's salute to Philip, in which he asks Philip to consider conversion as fulfilling a leader's obligation to care for their people. Philip responds that while he has considered conversion before, two main concerns keep him from doing so. Firstly, he worries that, if he converts, his followers will abandon him, thus leaving him weak and without their tributes. "This is such a temptation that neither I, nor any of the other great Sachems can tell how to get over" he says, but, "were this temptation removed, the way would be more easie and open for me to turn *praying Indian*."[47] The concept of subjection that Philip discusses was well-established in the Eastern Algonquian world by the 17th century. Subjects and sachems were bound through a system of mutual obligation: sachems were expected to respect and protect their subjects, and subjects were expected to regularly pay their sachems tribute, often in the form of deerskin and—increasingly after European arrival—wampum. Sachems might pay tribute to more powerful sachems from whom they

[45] Drake, *King Philip's War*, 248.
[46] Bowden and Ronda, *John Eliot's Indian Dialogues*, 165.
[47] Eliot, *Indian Dialogues*, 45. Emphasis original.

wanted protection; they also expected tribute from people whom they conquered.[48] These recognitions of submission and power underpinned major dynamics within the Indigenous system, and thus it makes sense that Philip's worries involve not only his personal loss of influence but the repercussions of overturning such a crucial cultural mechanism. William addresses Philip's fears by stating that, "if any of the *praying Indians* should be disobedient (in lawful things) and refuse to pay Tribute unto their Sachems, it is not their Religion and praying to God that teaches them so to do, but their Corruptions… I am sure the Word of God commandeth all to *be subject to the higher powers*, and to pay them Tribute." He then cites Jesus in the synoptic gospels: "*give unto Cesar the things that belong to Cesar, and to God the things that belong to God.*"[49] This verse has a long history of defining Christianity's relationship with the state, especially in places where Christians were persecuted or a minority group. Considered in Eliot's context, it suggests a middle road between Indigenous and English interests, designed to minimize ill feeling. The quote may seem strangely placed if one views *Indian Dialogues* as an attempt to convince the English authorities to support his missionary work. Authorities reading the text might protest that such a compromise limits their power over both Indigenous Christians and non-Christians by keeping the Indigenous leaders' prerogatives intact. But if we examine it more carefully, it advances a clear compromise that might lead to improved Anglo-Indigenous relations in the long term. One can imagine Eliot deftly holding up a finger to reply that, while it might not reap immediate benefits for English authorities, it would lead to an overall diffusion of tensions and avoid the violence menacing on the horizon. Conversion is the first step towards peace, and thus compromises to secure that conversion are necessary.

To understand the response to Philip's second concern, we must look at the historical events surrounding the actual King Philip. At the time of *Indian Dialogues*' publication, Philip had been the Wampanoag sachem for nine years and had engaged in extensive diplomacy with the Plymouth Colony. Along with other issues he had with the English,

[48] Pulsipher, "Subjects… Royal Political Power," 279.
[49] Ibid., 46; verse found in Mark 12:17, Matt 22:21, and Luke 20:25. Emphasis original.

including their paranoia around Indigenous uprisings, differing views of subjection and tribute, and continued snubs of his position, Philip disliked their supposed influence over Praying Indians. He viewed Indigenous Christians 'siding' with the English as reducing his personal power. In a way, struggles over loyalty remained within the scope of traditional Algonquian political life—the bands and sub-bands which made up the Indigenous political structure were constantly splitting off from larger groups, creating complex webs of diplomacy, intermarriage, and trade with each other. A leader's reputation depended on their ability to earn their followers' respect, as did their power in relation to other sachems. As such, their status fluctuated based on circumstance.[50] However, the unprecedented pressures of colonization challenged basic tenets of this structure and distinguished it from previous factional disputes.[51] Under these high stakes, any situation which revealed a leader's weakness could prove disastrous.[52] Loss of followers to English faith and systems of governance may have appeared to some as just such a weakness. Philip also faced competition over resources with Praying Indians specifically. In 1671, both Wampanoags under Philip and a large number of Praying Indians pledged oaths of fidelity to Plymouth Colony. This meant the colony had sizeable obligations to both groups, but with the same amount of resources as before.[53] In addition, the land which Philip sold (although he only sold it when it benefited him) largely went to rival Praying Indians and their praying towns.[54] Drake points to the failure of Plymouth Colony to protect Wompanoags from English and Praying Indian expansion as an inciting factor in the war which erupted in 1675.[55]

Eliot certainly had the events leading up to 1671 in mind when he composed *Indian Dialogues*, and the concern about land shows through in the response to the fictionalized Philip's second concern. Philip wonders how his power might change in relation to other

[50] Bowden and Ronda, *John Eliot's Indian Dialogues*, 9; Drake, *King Philip's War*, 57–9, 72.
[51] Van Lonkhuyzen, "A Reappraisal of the Praying Indians," 404.
[52] Drake, *King Philip's War*, 72.
[53] Ibid., 67–8.
[54] Ibid., 68.
[55] Ibid., 1.

sachems if he converts. He claims his people might be dissatisfied with him and break off to join other groups, making him weaker and "easily trod upon by others", as well as taking away his tribute.[56] He also dislikes the notion that Christians are all equal before God, as it might detract from his authority over his subjects. Anthony replies with Bible verses that encourage trust in the Lord and the rewards of faith, but William provides the supposedly real-life example of Cutshamekin. Cutshamekin was a Massachuset sachem—the first sachem Eliot ever preached to—and later a civic leader at Natick.[57] Eliot detailed the encounter (and subsequent visits) in his 1651 text *The Light appearing more and more towards the light of Day*, from Cutshamekin's initial hostile reception of Christianity to his supposed weakening under Eliot's reasonable arguments.[58] By bringing up a previous successful conversion, Eliot suggests that his efforts with Philip will be similarly successful—for in 1671, such a possibility was not as impossible as it seems to readers after 1676.[59] Furthermore, William expounds on the fate of Cutshamekin: he has suffered a downfall, but it was caused by his sale of land rather than his Christianity.

> But indeed the true Reason why sundry of *Cutshamoquin* his men left him, whereby he fell under poverty, was this, He sold unto the *English* all our Lands which lay by the Sea-side and Salt water, save onely one Field; and then it was, they went unto such other places as they liked better. And this one Field also, *Josias* sold away; and the Inland place, where we now live, Mr. *Eliot* procured for us, after we prayed to God.[60]

Given the recent sales of land conducted by the real-life Philip, preying on his fears of losing followers with this example seems a reasonable method of attempting to persuade him. Selling land by remaining at odds with the English will bring about his downfall and abandonment, but conversion to Christianity might, contrary to his concerns, bring him more land through the efforts of "Mr. Eliot." Eliot even makes mention of Natick, "the Inland place," won through successful litigation against other English people, as further

[56] Eliot, *Indian Dialogues*, 46.
[57] Pulsipher, *Subjects unto the Same King*, 74.
[58] Bross, *Dry Bones*, 121–3.
[59] Ibid., 120.
[60] Eliot, *Indian Dialogues*, 47.

proof. Besides this, Anthony adds, conversion will gain him support from English officials in the colony and in England, as well as from the Praying Indians spread throughout New England.[61] He implies that the bonds of Christian brotherhood are stronger than non-Christian Indigenous ties of subjection, or that the latter are enhanced by the former. But Philip remains unconvinced. Thus, the two Christians turn back to discussion of civic order to bolster their argument.

"Church-Order," declares William, "doth not abolish Civil Order, but establish it; Religion teacheth and commandeth reverence and obedience to Civil Rulers."[62] This statement adheres to typical Puritan application of this principle. But Eliot's past political theories seem to support a slightly different approach: one that espouses certain aspects of Indigenous governance, and again invites collaboration through compromise. Around the time of Natick's establishment in 1652, Eliot published *The Christian Commonwealth*, which laid out a new, idealized form of government based on scripture.[63] In her article, "Reading John Eliot's *The Christian Commonwealth* at Natick: An Origin Story", Natalie Spar argues that he also took inspiration from the traditional Wampanoag tribal organization. The Old Testament passages he uses arranges men into "judicial structures" of groups of tens, fifties, hundreds, and thousands, with each group of ten having its own leader.[64] Although Eliot does not explicitly acknowledge it, his structure "bears more resemblance to Wampanoag kinship networks than European territory-based politics." In addition, Eliot seems to have largely respected sachemships, with certain sachems already in power (such as Waban and Cutshamekin) becoming leaders of tens at Natick.[65] We cannot know how closely the

[61] Anthony claims that the Praying Indian population is substantial enough to outweigh making enemies of non-Christian Indigenous people; however, as stated by Bowden and Ronda (40), the 1,100 inhabitants of praying towns "represented hardly 10 percent of the native population on the mainland [of New England], and even then most of those residing at missionary sites were considered only potential Christians, as yet unbaptized." In other words, Eliot conducts a slight inflation of his and the Praying Indians' influence to add artificial weight to his argument.
[62] Eliot, *Indian Dialogues*, 49.
[63] Natalie Spar, "Reading John Eliot's *The Christian Commonwealth* at Natick: An Origin Story," *Early American Literature* 53, no. 1 (2018): 37. Eliot specifically singles out Exodus 18 as providing an ideal civic structure.
[64] Ibid., 39.
[65] Ibid., 41.

governance at Natick adhered to this ideal, as evidenced by the difference between the recorded and actual living habits of Praying Indians.[66] Likewise, we cannot know whether Eliot adopted certain aspects of Wampanoag society to encourage conversion through offering a compromise, or whether he even recognized the similarities at all. But given his willingness in *Indian Dialogues* and in practice to preserve sachems' authority, compromise would offer a consistent explanation. However, as he does not explain in *Indian Dialogues* what kind of authority Christians should respect, it is possible that he aims to simultaneously appeal to English authorities. For all his political, anti-monarchist theorizing in *The Christian Commonwealth*, Eliot did follow some English standards of governance. Praying towns themselves followed the English Puritan model of communal labour and worship.[67] Eliot actively encouraged Praying Indians to cultivate economic and social relationships with nearby English towns, and English patrons helped establish an Indigenous-run court system parallel to the English colonial one.[68] Thus, Praying Indians' adherence to "an organized English-style government within the praying towns must have increased the English colonists' sense of security, trusting that these Indians, at least, were no danger to them."[69] William's reassurance of Philip in Dialogue III, therefore, aims to satisfy both non-Christian Indigenous and English colonial demands for civic control.

The fictional Philip finds Anthony and William's arguments compelling and asks for some time to mull things over. Throughout the conversation, Philip uses language of injury or succumbing to describe the struggle with his conscience. For instance, he exclaims that he is "drowned and overwhelmed by the weight of your Reasonings"; on another occasion, he says, "I feel your words sink into my heart and stick there, you speak arrows; I feel that you wound me, but I do not think that you hurt me; nor do you mean me any hurt but good."[70] While these statements correspond with typical sentiments expressed in Puritan literature

[66] Drake, *King Philip's War*, 59–61.
[67] Pulsipher, *Subjects unto the Same King*, 74.
[68] Ibid.
[69] Ibid.
[70] Eliot, *Indian Dialogues*, 48, 51.

about conversion, they also present another subtle suggestion of Philip's subjugation, brought in to strengthen the promise to English officials desirous of gaining the upper hand. By the end of the lengthy dialogue, it seems Philip has completely come around. He laments:

> Who can oppose or gainsay the mountainous weight of these Arguments? I am more than satisfied, I am ashamed of my ignorance, and I abhor my self that I ever doubted of this point; and I desire wholly to give myself up to the knowledge of, and obedience to the word of God, and to abandon and forsake these sins which the word of God reproveth and condemneth.[71]

A fuller renunciation and pacification English officials could not hope for.

Eliot ends *Indian Dialogues* with a curious section tacked onto Dialogue III, in which John Speen, who was an Indigenous preacher at Natick, counsels an unnamed penitent.[72] Penitent comes to John in considerable distress, lamenting the hardships of life and his feelings of utter worthlessness and self-loathing ubiquitous to Puritan literature. This is the final stage in the conversion process charted throughout the text, the 'proper' completion of the convert's journey to salvation. Thomas Scanlan, in his book *Colonial Writing and the New World, 1583–1671: Allegories of Desire*, theorises that expression of self-loathing not only conformed to the Puritan model, but also functioned as "proof that the former selves of these natives were indeed completely eradicated."[73] He further argues that Penitent's acceptance of Christianity is so complete that he cannot help but fear his former, sinful self, and "[i]nsofar as being English is constituted by a fear of the Indians, the Penitent has turned English." This aligns with Eliot's idea that 'civilization'—i.e., adopting English lifestyles—constituted a step towards complete conversion, and he hoped praying towns would provide a locus for this dual transformation. "Eliot seems to suggest" in the dialogue between John and Penitent "that the process of conversion, because it will leave the Indians fearing themselves, will also leave them in a permanently submissive posture."[74] Although

[71] Ibid., 61.
[72] Boden and Ronda, *John Eliot's Indian Dialogues*, 166.
[73] Thomas Scanlan, "Fear and Self Loathing: John Eliot's *Indian Dialogues,*" in *Colonial Writing and the New World, 1583–1671: Allegories of Desire* (Cambridge University Press, 1999), 181.
[74] Ibid., 184.

Penitent is unnamed, we can interpret him as Philip: he says that his father was a sachem and he has inherited this position, as did the real Philip.[75] If we continue with this interpretation, we see Eliot's projection of a Philip in some future time, cowed and brought low by his newfound Christian convictions and well on his way to true Puritan piety.[76] It opens the possibility not only of a cessation of hostilities, but—even more sinisterly—a method for English officials to manipulate and take advantage of Indigenous leaders standing in their way.

Eliot closes his manuscript by leaving his two characters at peace, in prayer with one another.[77] This denouement completes the picture that Eliot proffers to English authorities—support his missionary work, complete with continued grants of land for praying towns, and he will resolve conflict with religious salvation and civic harmony. Whether or not English authorities read *Indian Dialogues*, they did not choose to follow this path. Less than four years later, King Philip's War, as it came to be known, ravaged Indigenous and English communities on both sides for nearly three bloodsoaked years.[78] Praying towns and Praying Indians suffered tremendously, as both English and non-Christian Indigenous people held intense animosity for them—in the eyes of each group, they 'belonged' to the enemy's side. Wartime "anti-Indian" hysteria from the colonists proved especially destructive.[79] By the end of the war, the English had forced the vast majority of Praying Indians from their towns onto barren land with little food, shelter, or medical supplies. While Christianity persisted in Praying Indian populations and their descendants, praying towns and Eliot's mission as a whole never recovered—the stark turn towards anti-Indigenous feeling, engendered by the war, meant that the English lumped all Indigenous people under the category of dangerous traitors.[80] The lands once occupied by praying towns fell finally and irrevocably into English hands. The offer of a new world held

[75] Eliot, *Indian Dialogues*, 69.
[76] Bowden and Ronda, *John Eliot's Indian Dialogues*, 50.
[77] Eliot, *Indian Dialogues*, 81.
[78] For the history of the war's name, see Drake, *King Philip's War*, 196–9.
[79] Bowden and Ronda, *John Eliot's Indian Dialogues*, 53.
[80] Ibid., 54.

out by *Indian Dialogues* never came to fruition, but it remains as a tantalizing 'what if' of history and, as a product in deep conversation with its context, an invaluable glimpse into an oft-overlooked piece of the struggle for 17th-century New England.

Bibliography

Bross, Kristina. *Dry Bones and Indian Sermons: Praying Indians in Colonial America*. Cornell University Press, 2004.

Drake, James David. *King Philip's War: Civil War in New England, 1675–1676*. Native Americans of the Northeast. University of Massachusetts Press, 1999.

Eliot, John. *Indian Dialogues, For Their Instruction in that great Service of Christ, in calling home their Country-men to the knowledge of God, and of Themselves, and of Jesus Christ.* Marmaduke Johnson, 1671. https://www.proquest.com/docview/2240860056/19299944?sourcetype=Books.

Eliot, John, Henry Warner Bowden, and James P. Ronda. *John Eliot's Indian Dialogues: A Study in Cultural Interaction.* Greenwood Press, 1980.

Gookin, Daniel. *Historical Collections of the Indians in New England* [1674], reprinted in *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, 1st ser. (1792), 179. Quoted in Drake, James David. *King Philip's War: Civil War in New England, 1675–1676*. Native Americans of the Northeast. University of Massachusetts Press, 1999.

Gray, Kathryn N. *John Eliot and the Praying Indians of Massachusetts Bay: Communities and Connections in Puritan New England*. Bucknell University Press, 2013.

"John Eliot, 'Apostle to the Indians' in New England." Jesus College, Cambridge. Accessed 29 April 2025. http://www.jesus.cam.ac.uk/about-jesus-college/old-library-archives/exhibitions/john-eliot/promoting-and-propagating-the-gospel/.

"July 1649: An Act for the promoting and propagating the Gospel of Jesus Christ in New England," in *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum, 1642–1660*. Edited by C. H. Firth and R. S. Rait, *British History Online*, accessed 29 April 2025, https://www.british-history.ac.uk/no-series/acts-ordinances-interregnum/pp197-200.

Pawlicki, Sarah. "'I Hear That God Saith Work': Wunnampuhtogig and Puritans Laboring for Grace in Massachusetts, 1643–1653'. *Early American Studies, An Interdisciplinary Journal* 20, no. 2 (Spring 2022): 189–214.

Pulsipher, Jenny Hale. *Subjects unto the Same King: Indians, English, and the Contest for Authority in Colonial New England*. Early American Studies. University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005.

Pulsipher, Jenny Hale. "Subjects… Unto the Same King: New England Indians and the Use of Royal Political Power." In *Colonial America: Essays in Politics and Social Development*, edited by Stanley N. Katz et al., 6th ed. Routledge, 2011.

Ranlet, Philip. "Another Look at the Causes of King Philip's War." *The New England Quarterly* 61, no. 1 (March 1, 1988): 79–100. Quoted in Drake, James David. *King Philip's War: Civil War in New England, 1675–1676*. Native Americans of the Northeast. University of Massachusetts Press, 1999.

Scanlan, Thomas. "Fear and Self Loathing in John Eliot's *Indian Dialogues*." In *Colonial Writing and the New World, 1583–1671: Allegories of Desire*. Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Silverman, David J. "Indians, Missionaries, and Religious Translation: Creating Wampanoag Christianity in Seventeenth-Century Martha's Vineyard". *The William and Mary Quarterly* 62, no. 2 (2005): 141–74. https://doi.org/10.2307/3491598.

Spar, Natalie. 'Reading John Eliot's *The Christian Commonwealth* at Natick: An Origin Story'. *Early American Literature* 53, no. 1 (2018): 33–67.

Van Lonkhuyzen, Harold W. 'A Reappraisal of the Praying Indians: Acculturation, Conversion, and Identity at Natick, Massachusetts, 1646–1730'. *The New England Quarterly* 63, no. 3 (1990): 396–428. https://doi.org/10.2307/366370.

Red Roots: Betty Millard's Stake in Communism Beyond the Confines of the Model Feminist

Adela Hoffman
Smith College

China and Berlin, 1949–1951. Sophia Smith Collection of Women's History, Smith College Archives, Northampton, MA.

"It's not that nothing never changes– it's just that it changes minimally and always differently from the way you think it's going to."[1] Elizabeth Millard wrote these words in retrospect of her time within the Communist Party. A woman faithfully devoted to the American Communist dream from 1936 to 1956, Millard imagined a world within her lifetime free of poverty and prejudice. Reflecting on her youthful optimism, Millard chuckled at her naive dreams of retiring in her old age as a "heroic old Bolshevik."[2] Although Millard abandoned the Communist Party USA in the mid 1950s, her commitment to dismantling a racist, sexist, and classist world order never faltered. However, within the historical academy, Millard's vast production of literature for the Communist party falls neatly into one singular category: feminism. Historian and leading scholar in the field of American feminist Communists Kate Weigand argues that Millard and her fellow Communist feminists "set in motion a powerful movement to transform women's status and gender relations that continues to shape American politics and culture."[3]

Although Communist feminists contributed significantly to women's struggle for gender equality, the Communist Party and the historical academy have largely ignored their other contributions to the broader American Communist movement. Women within the Communist Party have withstood two separate rounds of patriarchal cleansing. The Communist party itself inflicted the first round, limiting women to organize and write for their female peers and barring them from substantial roles of authority and influence.[4] Although many women comrades recognized this chauvinistic attitude and promptly fought to dismantle sexism systematically within the party, they experienced varying levels of success. Historians themselves inflicted the second round. Women largely exist in their own category historically: as feminist activists, feminist authors, feminist philanthropists, etc. This reflects a much larger societal assumption that the term "feminist" can be interchanged

[1] Betty Millard Short Story "Love All," Box 1, Folder 12, Betty Millard Papers 1911–2010, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College Special Collections.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Kate Weigand, *Red Feminism: American Communism and the Making of Women's Liberation* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001), 14.
[4] Ibid., 4.

with the word "woman." The historical academy functions under the assumption that any woman participating in traditionally male dominated fields furthers the feminist agenda simply by existing. However, this double patriarchal fragmentation of women in history makes it impossible to fully embrace the multitudes of women's contributions to society.

Betty Millard established herself as a respected journalist, feminist, and activist. However, much of the work she produced does not center solely on women's issues. In fact, Millard originally joined the Communist Party in resistance to the United States' support of Francico Franco during the Spanish Civil War, not the Communist Party's commitment to gender equality.[5] Her determination to dismantle oppressive regimes and fight imperialism presents itself consistently throughout her work, along with her feminist ideology. Of course, Millard dedicated herself to ending all forms of social hierarchy and oppression, including sex discrimination, but the Communist Party and American historical academy have minimized her other social contributions in order to uplift and simultaneously confine her as a feminist icon. In order to properly analyze Betty Millard, her anti-colonial, anti-capitalist, and feminist sentiments must be given equal priority and attention.

This paper is an intellectual history of Millard that investigates her understanding of communism and feminism, and criticizes the historical academy and Communist Party for their role in flattening women in history to a singular facet of their identities. Focusing mainly on Millard's time as a member of the Communist Party from the mid-thirties to mid-fifties, I will showcase Millard's complex understanding of sex discrimination as a product of capitalism and social conditioning, her deeply rooted commitment to fighting a colonial world order, and her personal devotion to dismantling facism and capitalism. Utilizing Millard's vast publications for the Communist party in the progressive magazines *New Masses* and *Latin America Today* and her personal writings, this paper will convey Millard as a dedicated communist, first and foremost, rather than as a feminist alone. Focusing on Millard as a feminist first and communist second falsely prioritizes her

[5] Betty Millard Short Story "Love All," Box 1, Folder 12, Betty Millard Papers 1911–2010, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College Special Collections.

commitment to gender equality above her commitment to anti-fascism and anti-colonialism. By focusing solely on her feminism, we lose Millard's contributions to the broader anti-capitalist communist movement outside of feminism.

Part 1: Millard the Anti-Fascist

> He looked angrily away. Then he gripped her shoulder and said harshly, "It's because you can't understand about Franco. About the killings, the arms and legs scattered in the street. The screaming when a bomb comes. If I caught Franco I would run a bayonet through him until I was too tired to pull it out. You know what he did to me too? Now I am never going to be happy again. Now I can never be happy any more," he cried.[6]
> — Betty Millard, c. 1930

Millard's fiction from her early life offers us a window into her frame of mind. Although one excerpt from an unfinished story, like the one above, should not be extrapolated to demonstrate her entire world view, the brutal depiction of killing fascist dictators appeared throughout Millard's short stories from the 1930s and early 1940s. This particular short story entitled "The Repatriate" details how a young Spanish man, Stephan, tries to cope with the horrors he's seen in Spain under Franco, including the murder of his best friend. He is at a young woman's apartment, and although she wants to dance and listen to the radio, Stephan finds himself preoccupied with the past and Spain's descent into fascism. Stephan pushes the young woman he is seeing to indulge him in his violent political urges and he attempts to inspire similar hatred in her. Alas, the young woman finds his obsession concerning and asks him to leave her apartment. Millard's own passion and political views come through in her personal fiction, demonstrating her empathy for the rage felt by the Spanish people under Franco's brutal regime. Millard's obsession with graphically depicting the murders of Fascist leaders, like Hitler and Franco, fit into a larger narrative of how she understood fascism, communism, and capitalism.

In order to fully understand Millard as a communist, she first needs to be understood as an anti-fascist. The Communist International functioned as the official governing body

[6] Betty Millard Papers, short story "The Repatriate," Box 29, Folder 11, Betty Millard Papers 1911–2010, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College Special Collections.

for the international communist movement, holding conferences and distributing literature.[7] The Sixth World Congress of the Communist International composed a program entitled "Program of the Communist International, Together With Its Constitution" in 1929, which detailed the official communist ideology that all national CPs should abide by. Millard collected the third edition in 1936, the same year she joined the Young Communist League, two years after she graduated from Barnard College.[8] The program explicitly detailed the roots of fascism as "instability of capitalist relationships; the existence of a considerable declassed social element, the pauperization of broad strata of the urban petty bourgeois and intelligentsia; discontent among the rural petty bourgeoisie and, finally, the constant menace of mass proletarian action."[9] Essentially, the Communist Party's explanation of fascism places it directly in opposition to communism. When capitalist societies begin to fail, the social hierarchies that capitalism perpetuates start to crumble into increasing class instability and general discontent.

Communists, following the Communist Internationals' ideology, believed that a communist revolution should naturally follow this instability. However, when the state apparatus attempts to hold onto power, it adopts new methods and forms of administration that work to consolidate power away from the people.[10] This consolidation of power in the form of "inner cabinets and oligarchical groups acting behind the scenes" works to "destroy the revolutionary vanguard of the working class."[11] This understanding of fascism not only as the product of late stage capitalism but as an ideological force created to combat Communism offers us a deeper explanation of Millard's staunch anti-fascist sentiments. Millard continued to apply this framework to her journalistic writings while a member of CP-USA.

---

[7] "The Communist International," *Advocate of Peace through Justice* 86, no. 12 (1924): 659, http://www.jstor.org/stable/20660772.
[8] Betty Millard Time Line, Box 1, Folder 12, Betty Millard Papers 1911–2010, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College Special Collections.
[9] Vladimir Lenin, *Program of the Communist International, Together With Its Constitution*, 3rd Edition (Workers Library Publishers, 1936), https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=osu.32435017158270&seq=8, 24.
[10] Ibid.
[11] Ibid., 24–5.

When Millard joined the Communist Party officially in 1940, she established herself as an editor and writer for the progressive magazine *New Masses* and became an active member of The Congress of American Women.[12] In 1949 she joined the Women's International Democratic Federation, WIDF, which sponsored her to travel to Europe and beyond the Iron Curtain to report on the status of women and attend international women's conferences.[13] Considering Millard's anti-fascist convictions as well as her feminist ideology provides a more accurate analysis of her journalism for the WIDF. Millard created a short pamphlet entitled "Women on Guard: How the Women of the World Fight for Peace" in 1952.[14] She discussed the privilege American women experienced because of their physical separation from the wars of the 20th century, and depicts the rising fear women abroad experienced because of the escalating Cold War. She wrote, "Women of Western Europe are told that they must be prepared to give their sons in a 'crusade against communism.' But they remember another 'crusade against communism'—only a few years ago—Hitler's. They remember how dearly it cost them. They know that another such war would be a thousand times more dreadful."[15] Analyzing this quote from a feminist perspective leads us to believe Millard's sole motivation to push for peace was to spare the women of Western Europe from more war and death. However, in this passage, Millard offered her readers a complex criticism of American imperialism through comparing the American anti-communist rhetoric during the Cold War to fascist Nazi Germany's rhetoric. She created a broader allusion to America as a country floundering in the midst of a rising pro-communist world order, slipping into fascist ideology in order to maintain power.

Millard continually compared American warmongering abroad to Nazism. Without a full understanding of Millard's devotion to anti-fascism, readers might interpret these

[12] Betty Millard Time Line, Box 1, Folder 12, Betty Millard Papers 1911–2010, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College Special Collections.
[13] Betty Millard Time Line, Box 1, Folder 12, Betty Millard Papers 1911–2010, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College Special Collections.
[14] Betty Millard pamphlet "Women on Guard," February 1952, Box 29, folder 10, Betty Millard Papers 1911–2010, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College Special Collections.
[15] Ibid.

allusions as hyperbole to grab their attention, making them seem out of place—especially considering that her most popular feminist work, "Women Against Myth," only mentions Nazism and fascism once. For instance, Millard wrote an article for *New Masses* in 1952 entitled "A Look at 'Operation Killer,'" where she detailed the horrors of the Korean War and implored Americans to see through the American war propaganda machine. She wrote:,

> These people (Americans) forget that any soldiers taking part in an aggressive war of annihilation against a whole people, become quickly brutalized and commit acts that they themselves would never have dreamed themselves capable of a few months before. *An unjust war can only be fought by barbarous means.* An army's politics determines its techniques.
> Of course, the U.S. soldier is only obeying orders.
> So was the Nazi.[16]

Millard insisted on pushing the comparison of America's unjust wars to Nazism in order to highlight the hypocrisy within the American government. This excerpt from Millard's article created a clear distinction between the American people and the American government, highlighting her dedication to not blaming individuals for the failings of their government. However, she made clear the consequences of becoming a tool to export capitalism and violence, condemning American soldiers to the same fate as Nazis. Millard urged her reader throughout her article "Operation Killer" to analyze the American war machine and consider the benefits communism offers when compared to the violence produced by capitalism. Her point that "an army's politics determines its techniques" directly criticized capitalistic wars because they wage for profit, not human betterment.[17] Communist literature on the inherent ties between fascism and capitalism influenced Millard's writing and anti-war agenda. Millard's insistence on highlighting the parallels between the American anti-communist agenda and the fascist regimes of the 1930s and 1940s in her writings demonstrates her commitment to communism, as an anti-fascist.

[16] Betty Millard article saved in personal travel journal "Operation Killer," November 1951, Box 3, Folder 2, Betty Millard Papers 1911–2010, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College Special Collections.
[17] Ibid.

Understanding Millard as an anti-fascist illuminates complexity in her writings that a feminist lens fails to provide. Millard's commitment to peace and critiquing American warmongering demonstrates her dedication to communism as an ideology, again in ways her feminist literature does not. Although Millard's feminist ideology gave her further opportunities to participate in the international communist movement, such as her enrollment in the WIDF, they did not singularly shape her understanding of communism. Anti-fascism from an early age dictated her political and journalistic career in equal measure to feminism. Stephan's words for Franco, "You see these thumbs? I would gouge his eyes out. Slowly. It would be horribly painful. I would pull his nails out" find themselves neatly aligned with Millard's personal fervent dedication to ending fascism.[18]

Part Two: Millard the Anti-Colonialist, Anti-Imperialist, and Communist

"Now I wish I could tell you about my country that would make it seem less remote, grim and unreal to you– that's the way it seemed to me after two years away. I've gotten used to the fat cars, fat newspapers and fat people, and the ceaseless, hopeless attempt to make people think the outer world is inhabited by insatiable demons on the one hand and hungry millions on the other who hope we will save them from the demons."[19] Millard wrote these words to her lifelong friend and pen pal Gita in 1952. Millard had just finished her two-year tour of the Soviet Union, Europe, and East Asia, overwhelmed by the sights of collapsed capitalist empires reborn as communist utopias. Returning to the heart of capitalist imperialism, the United States weighed heavily on her. Millard understood American prosperity and opulence as rewards reaped from an exploitative capitalist system at the expense of unofficial American colonies.[20] Millard recognized the American propaganda machine in the early fifties as hopelessly dedicated to the demonization of all communists

[18] Betty Millard Papers short story "The Repatriate," Box 29, Folder 11, Betty Millard Papers 1911–2010, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College Special Collections.
[19] Betty Millard Papers to Gita Banertea, April 17 1952, Box 17, Folder 4, Betty Millard Papers 1911–2010, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College Special Collections.
[20] Betty Millard draft article, 18 March 1955, Sophia Smith Collection, Box 18, Folder 3, Betty Millard Papers 1911–2010, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College Special Collections.

and the infantilization of all non-American civilians as hungry masses desperate for American intervention and protection.

Analyzing communist ideology and its critiques of capitalism helps to properly understand Millard's criticism of the United States' foreign policy as well as her anti-colonialism. The "Program of the Communist International, Together With Its Constitution" offers insights into the official Communist Party's opinions regarding imperialism, colonialism, and capitalism. The first chapter of the pamphlet describes the characteristic features of a capitalist society which they claim "arose on the basis of commodity production" and are "the monopoly of the most important and vital means of production by the capitalist class and big landlords; the exploitation of the wage labor of the proletariat...the production of commodities for profit."[21] Essentially, a small elite class holds a monopoly on the vital resources of production so that the working class must sell their labor to the elite who produce goods for profit. This system leads to an exploitative relationship between the elites and working class, the bourgeoisie and proletariat: economic domination and politics driven by capitalism.[22] The chapter also claims that "in its quest for profits the bourgeoisie was compelled to develop the productive forces on an ever-increasing scale and to strengthen and expand domination of capitalist relations of production."[23] The CP understood capitalism as ever-expanding and inherently exploitative. The surging scale of capitalism developed to a global level, producing imperialism. The second part of the first chapter details this transition. It describes how capitalism evolved smoothly while unclaimed land, people, and resources existed and how the colonies of capitalist countries experienced the most brutal effects of extracting labor. Therefore, colonies shoulder the burden of production while becoming further removed from the profits of commodities.[24] The pamphlet also claims that "free competition rapidly gave way to monopoly, the previously "available" colonial lands had already been divided up, and the struggle for a redistribution

[21] Lenin, *Program of the Communist International*, 11.
[22] Ibid.
[23] Ibid.
[24] Ibid., 13.

of colonial and spheres of influence inevitably" lead to armed struggles.[25] These armed struggles lead to finance capitalism, otherwise known as imperialism, which lead to "a new form of gigantic combinations of enterprises linked up into one system by the banks."[26] The oppressive nature of capitalism, which on a small scale represents the abuse of landowners over their tenants, reinforces itself on a larger scale: the population of entire nations under colonial rule as the tenant answering to a foreign country that controls the land, enterprise, and finance.[27] However, the ever-increasing nature of capitalism results in the intensified abuse of the working class. The final section of the first chapter details how "imperialism is creating a type of decaying and parasitically degenerate rentier-states as well as a whole state of parasites who live by clipping coupons."[28] In the formation of concentration of the means of production and the extensive abuse of the proletariat, communists believed that these combined factors created the perfect conditions for an uprising of the working class and the success of communism.[29] This understanding of the interconnectedness of capitalism, imperialism, colonialism, and communism presents itself in Millard's writings.

Millard's anti-colonial sentiments moved to the forefront of her political writing and activism after her two years abroad between 1949 and 1950. She attended conferences throughout the Soviet Union and China hosted by the Women's International Democratic Federation. In late November 1949, Millard travelled by train from Moscow to Peking to attend the Conference of the Women of Asia. Her railway companions consisted of representatives from France, England, Holland, India, the USSR, Cuba, Algeria, Israel, and Czechoslovakia. Millard noted in an article for the *Daily Worker* the impressive backgrounds and works these representatives committed themselves to: Jeanette Vermeersch dedicated her life to leading the French crusade against the war in Vietnam. Rie, a Dutch Auschwitz

[25] Ibid.
[26] Ibid., 14.
[27] Ibid., 16.
[28] Ibid., 19.
[29] Ibid.

survivor, led Dutch women against the shipment of arms to Indonesia.[30] The women at WIDF conferences devoted themselves after World War II to resisting their countries' involvement in colonial enterprises through their involvement in the Communist Party. Millard's time spent with the WIDF pushed her to further her understanding of the interconnected nature of capitalism and colonialism. Analyzing the articles Millard wrote about the WIDF conferences in the Soviet Union and China between 1949 and 1950 from a solely feminist lens detracts from Millard's broader understanding of communism as a necessary tool to dismantle a capitalistic and imperialistic world order. For instance, in Millard's article "Asia's Women Meet Where Manchu Emperors Ruled" she wrote:

> The Viet-Nam delegate related how troops of children cluster around the doors of restaurants in Saigon, hoping to be allowed to lick the customer's empty plates. As in most colonial countries, the misery is so profound that mothers sell their children to factories, to plantations, to houses of prostitution, in order to not see them starve before their eyes.[31]

Interpreting Millard's intense depiction of women and children suffering under colonial rule solely in the context of her as a feminist leads us to believe that her anti-colonial beliefs relied on the suffering of women and children. Rather, Millard's understanding of colonialism developed from her commitment to dismantling capitalism. To Millard, capitalism required colonial oppression and extraction, which, in turn, produced the mass suffering of the working class, especially its most vulnerable members: women and children. Conveying Millard's personal commitment to communism as a result of her dedication to protecting women and children distracts from Millard's commitment to communism and anti-colonialism. Assuming that the foundation of women activists' ideology rests solely on their gender blatantly belittles women's contributions to social progress outside the realm of feminism.

Upon returning to the United States, given the House of Un-American Activities' disintegration of the Congress of American Women, Millard found herself in need of new

[30] Betty Millard article saved in personal travel journal, "Asia's Women Meet Where Manch Emperor's Ruled," 18 April, 1950, Box 3, Folder 2, Betty Millard Papers 1911–2010, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College Special Collections.
[31] Ibid.

employment. She landed a position as editor and writer for a progressive Latin American news magazine, *Latin America Today*. Millard again wrote to Gita sharing her news. Casually, she noted that the magazine's purpose "is to fulfill at least in a small way our responsibility toward our Latin-American friends."[32] She quipped that her "chief qualifications for the job seem to be that I know nothing about South America and do not read Spanish."[33] Millard found herself in unfamiliar territory. However, once Millard became embroiled in the politics and history of Latin America she wrote to Gita explaining that, "I can pay attention to women now only in my spare time. I've learned a whole lot about our neighbors to the south and I'm amazed at how ignorant I was about a very important part of the world, also how ignorant everybody here is on that subject."[34] Millard's feminist ideology accompanied her sense of responsibility toward Latin America. Given the women she met during her WIDF tour and their commitment to resisting their countries' colonial agendas, Millard's choice to explore the United States' most vast and precious area of extraction becomes clearer when her commitment to anti-colonialism is weighed equally with her commitment to feminism.

On March 9, 1953 Betty Millard wrote a letter to her mother from Guatemala, "We love this place. We've talked to a number of people about the land reform, which is an all important topic here…Thousands of peasants have already got land of their own for the first time in their lives. Now, instead of paying 50% to 70% of their crops to the landlord, as those who rented land formerly did, they pay only 3% to 5% off their crops a year to the government over 35 years as payment for the land."[35] The removal of landlords' land into the hands of the people, regulated by the government instead of private individuals, demonstrates the potential breakdown of capitalistic exploitation in Guatemala. Land reform became one of Millard's most reported topics published in *Latin America Today*. Her

[32] Betty Millard to Gita Banertea, 17 April 1952, Box 17, Folder 4, Sophia Smith Collection, Betty Millard Papers 1911–2010, Smith College Special Collections.
[33] Ibid.
[34] Ibid.
[35] Betty Millard to Elizabeth Bell Boynton, 9 March 1953, Box 17, Folder 14, Betty Millard Papers 1911–2010, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College Special Collections.

personal correspondence with her mother reflects her excitement and commitment to empowering the working class to advocate for themselves and dismantle colonial systems of oppression. Communism on a domestic scale requires the working class to rise up against exploitative bourgeoisie who utilize the working class's labor in order to hoard wealth.[36] This model of class exploitation reinforces itself on an international scale as well. Millard understood the United States as the bourgeoisie extracting labor from Latin America, not only cementing inequality but also contributing to its exponential growth.[37] Colonialism describes the practice of extracting resources from one country for the benefit of another, often involving political control. Although in the 1950s, when Millard wrote and edited *Latin America Today*, the United States technically had no colonies, she recognized the colonial exploitation the United States exercised within Latin America.[38]

Millard understood American support for dictators in Latin America as a political tool to keep corrupt capitalist governments in power so that the United States could continue to exploit their resources.[39] Millard wrote in one of her unpublished articles that the two main reasons Latin Americans hated the United States were the semi-colonial relations and the support of dictators.[40] She noted that "our support of these dictators is little known by most Americans but is well known and hotly resented by several million Latin Americans. The support is given in the name of anti-communism but, the words of Dr. Eduardo Santos, former president of Columbia, 'The flag of anti-communism in Latin America has been transformed into a pirate's banner…'"[41] Millard's dedication to reporting on Latin America stemmed both from her personal attachment to dismantling colonial exploitation and her dedication to informing Americans of the contradictions and misinformation of the U.S. government.[42] The United States justified their intervention into

[36] Lenin, *Program of the Communist International*, 16.
[37] Betty Millard draft article, 18 March 1955, Sophia Smith Collection, Box 18, Folder 3, Betty Millard Papers 1911–2010, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College Special Collections.
[38] Ibid.
[39] Ibid.
[40] Ibid.
[41] Ibid.
[42] Ibid.

Latin America as a protective measure against communism.[43] Millard understood this as a scapegoat tactic so the U.S. could maintain political control.[44] Given Millard's attunement to the interwoven political forces at play in Latin America, her prolonged dedication to writing and reporting on Latin America aligns with her personal allegiance to dismantling capitalism and colonialism.

Analyzing Millard's writings in accompaniment with the broader communist ideology helps us to better understand her commitment to reporting on Latin America and dismantling American imperialism. Tracing her time in the WIDF, the people she met, and the articles she wrote creates clear throughlines between her feminist ideology and anti-colonialism. Investigating Millard's writings on anti-imperialism allows us to have a broader understanding of her belief system and communist ideology than a singularly feminist lens allows.

Part 3: Millard the Red Feminist

> Fran and I loved Russian movies... I remember one called 'Tanya' in which a beautiful but poor young peasant woman is at first scorned by the men peasants when she tries to improve the lot of the collective's pigs and then later she becomes president of the whole collective farm and is sent to Moscow as an example of the new socialist woman. I cried all the way through that film several times: what it meant to me was that you could be a woman and be strong at the same time.[45]
>
> — Betty Millard, Date Unknown

Although Betty Millard's feminist writings do not sufficiently explain her joining the Communist Party or her commitment to reporting on Latin America, Millard did experience a profound sense of hope and validation because of the Soviet Union's depiction of women. Her most famous piece of literature, "Women Against Myth," illustrated the Soviet Union as virtually free from gender discrimination. Given middle-class American women's visible ousting from the workforce in the postwar period and digression back to their prewar status, Millard's idealization of the strong, working Soviet woman with

[43] Ibid.
[44] Ibid.
[45] Betty Millard Short Story "Love All," Box 1, Folder 12, Betty Millard Papers 1911–2010, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College Special Collections.

state-sponsored childcare and equal distribution of household labor proves understandable. However, Millard's experience within the Communist Party exposed itself as more similar to the beginning of 'Tanya' than the end.

In order to understand why the CP-USA considered Millard's feminism revolutionary, first we must analyze how the CP approached the "woman question" before Millard. The Constitution of the U.S.S.R. functioned as the political blueprint for all communist parties around the world, including CP-USA. The U.S.S.R. Constitution states in article 122 that, "Women in the U.S.S.R are accorded equal rights with men in all spheres of economic, state, cultural, social and political life."[46] The Soviet Union's constitution offered women more rights than most Western countries, demonstrating the attractiveness of communism to progressive women. In the Introduction, written by N. Krupskaya, to the 1921 pamphlet "Women and Society" by Vladimir Lenin (one of the communist party's foundational political theorists), Krupskaya explains that, "From the very outset our Party has devoted a great deal of attention to the emancipation of women, exposing the economic and political roots of women's inequality."[47] This quote represents how the standard communist understanding of women's inequality revolved around economic and political conditions. Lenin noted that Western countries had not abolished obsolete laws that place women in an inferior position to men because "where capitalism exists, where the private ownership of the land, the private ownership of factories and works is preserved, where the power of capital is preserved, men will pertain their privileges."[48] Lenin claims that sexism is inherently tied to capitalism, and while capitalism exists, women cannot experience true equality. Despite Lenin's calls for gender equality and diagnosis that capitalism produces gender inequality, throughout his pamphlet, he still refers to women's *inherent* "weaker position" as the reason why they experience excessive exploitation under capitalism.[49]

[46] Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (1936), art. 122.
[47] Vladimir Lenin, *Women and Society*, intro. N. Krupskaya (International Publishers, 1938), 5.
[48] Ibid., 15.
[49] Ibid., 16.

In his pamphlet, Lenin continued to describe one of the leading causes of women's oppression as housework. He writes, "As long as women engage in housework their position is still a restricted one. In order to achieve complete emancipation of women and to make them really equal with men, we must have social economy, and the participation of women in general productive labor."[50] Lenin described housework as petty, stultifying, and unproductive.[51] Although Lenin advocated for full gender equality and diagnosed the root cause of sex discrimination as capitalism, his pamphlet demonstrates his own underlying misogyny. His references to women's weaker position, accompanied with his description of housework as petty signifies a warning sign. Lenin's pamphlet on women and society functioned as the roadmap for how communists should address the "woman question," but the contradictions within the pamphlet itself raised questions for women within the party who saw room for improvement.

Looking at Lenin's pamphlet offers us insight into the underlying misogyny within the communist party, but looking at criticism from the women in CP-USA during the 1940s and 50s demonstrates how this misogyny affected the practices of the party claiming dedication to women's equality. Kate Weigand's book *Red Feminism* works to explain the party's contradictions regarding CP-USA misogyny and how communist feminists addressed these issues. Mary Inman, a longtime Marxist and CP-USA member from 1936–1945, for example, claimed that communist demonization of housework stemmed from misogyny rather than the oppressive nature of housework.[52] She advocated for Communist leaders to see housework as productive labor like factory work, but party members who worried that this interpretation would reinforce the notion that a woman belonged in the home rejected her analysis.[53] Inman's case demonstrates the CP-USA's reluctance to adopt changes to their feminist ideology and address the potential sexism within their approach to the "woman question."

[50] Ibid., 14.
[51] Ibid.
[52] Weigand, *Red Feminism*, 28.
[53] Ibid., 29.

The Communist Party functioned as one of the most influential left-wing political organizations during the 1940s and 50s, and yet their members still perpetuated sexist stereotypes. Millard wanted to grapple with this blatant contradiction of advocating for equality while ignoring the male chauvinism within the organization. Millard's "Women Against Myth" works to understand this contradiction and address sexism inside the party. Millard refuted one of the most common explanations of women's oppression, "Is it true or is it a myth that 'women like to be dominated?'"[54] Millard understood women's oppression as a result of both capitalism and patriarchy, however, unlike colonialism and racism, capitalism alone does not produce sexism.[55] She argued that the ways society conditions girls resulted in the degradation of their self worth and subconsciously embedded in women an inherent feeling of inferiority to men.[56] Betty Millard believed that communism alone did not inherently produce gender equality, rather that individuals needed to address their own male chauvinistic attitudes in order to understand the ways in which they subconsciously oppress women. Millard's argument did not stop at diagnosing women's oppression as a product of social conditioning. She claimed that women's oppression transcended class oppression, the basis of communist ideology, because all women experienced oppression regardless of class. She wrote in "Women Against Myth" that "economics, religion, customs, taboos impose conflicting roles and wishes on women, who are unable to function fully in society as both mothers and citizens not because of their special biological natures but because every society until the advent of socialism has made it economically and socially impossible for them to do so."[57] This, she argued, affected all women regardless of class. Millard's pamphlet received widespread attention, forcing the CP-USA to change their portrayal of women in magazines and literature in order to combat the social conditioning Millard diagnosed.[58] Similarly, her pamphlet equipped individual

[54] Elizabeth Millard, *Women Against Myth* (International Publishers, 1948), 6, https://www.davidanthembookseller.com/pages/books/11602/betty-millard/woman-against-myth.
[55] Ibid., 7.
[56] Ibid.
[57] Ibid., 12.
[58] Weigand, *Red Feminism*, 86.

communist women with the tools necessary to address the sex discrimination they experienced from men within the party.[59] Millard's radical pamphlet solidified her as a well-respected communist feminist dedicated to addressing gender inequality within the Communist Party.

Conclusion

Millard's radical feminist position challenged Lenin's, and therefore the Communist Party's, interpretation of the woman question. She reached beyond the ideological principles set before her by the party and enacted real change for individuals and broader party ideology. Millard's feminism sets her apart from other communists and explains why historians often choose this facet of her identity to analyze. However, Millard's advocacy, literature, and ideology expanded beyond her commitment to gender equality. Analyzing her personal works of writing and her articles pertaining to international events demonstrates her deep-felt commitment to anti-colonialism and anti-fascism. Her works as a feminist intersected with these other commitments, demonstrating her more nuanced belief system. Although Millard's work "Women Against Myth" presents itself as one of the most influential pieces of feminist literature from the early 20th century, published internationally, her commitment to communism went beyond feminism. Historians' conceptions of Betty Millard demonstrate the ways in which the historical academy limits women as political actors. In giving equal weight to Millard's dedication to anti-fascism and anti-colonialism, as to her feminism, I offer a more holistic understanding of Millard as a communist and individual who works to combat the implicit sexism within the historical academy.

[59] Weigand, *Red Feminism*, 84.

Bibliography

Betty Millard papers, Sophia Smith Collection, SSC-MS-00673, Smith College Special Collections, Northampton, Massachusetts. https://findingaids.smith.edu/repositories/2/archival_objects/157931. Accessed May 12, 2025.

Lenin, Vladimir. Program of the Communist International, Together With Its Constitution. 3rd Edition. Workers Library Publishers, 1936. https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=osu.32435017158270&seq=8.

Lenin, Vladimir. *Women and Society*. Little Lenin Library, Vol. 23. International Publishers, 1938.

Millard, Elizabeth. Women Against Myth. International Publishers, 1948. https://www.davidanthembookseller.com/pages/books/11602/betty-millard/woman-against-myth.

Weigand, Kate. *Red Feminism: American Communism and the Making of Women's Liberation*. Johns-Hopkins University Press, 2001.

"The Communist International." *Advocate of Peace through Justice* 86, no. 12 (1924): 659–63. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20660772.

Soviet Union. *Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: As Amended and Supplemented by the First, Second, Third, Sixth, Seventh and Eighth Sessions of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR*. Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1938.

Clash and Collapse: The Legal Interactions between Buddhist and Dynastic Laws in Tang Dynasty

Conger Wang
University of Edinburgh

Tang Wuzong (public domain). Wikimedia Commons.

> It exhausted the empire's labours in architectures; deprived its wealth in adorning temples; drawing people into the mentorship of its own order, and thus sowed discords between the emperor and his subjects, parents and their children; and separated spouses from each other. Nothing is more harmful than the Buddhist law.
>
> – Emperor Wuzong of Tang
> *The Decree on the Destruction of Temples and Laicization of Monks and Nuns*

> 勞人力於土木之功, 奪人利於金寶之飾, 遺君親於師資之際, 遠配偶於戒律之間, 壞法害人, 無逾此道。
>
> – 唐武宗《毀佛寺勒僧尼還俗》[1]

The statement cited above is extracted from Emperor Wuzong of Tang's (r. 840–6) decree ordering the persecution of Buddhism in 845.[2] This decree worths exploration because it expressed the imperial concern over the rise of Buddhism, and portrayed Buddhism as an aggressively expanding religion possessing the ambition and potential to swallow the resources of the Tang empire, which image diverged dramatically from what was preached in the Vinaya demanding renunciation from desires and observations of the 'formless world.'[3] This essay then seeks to explore how the Buddhist laws transformed into a real source of anxiety for the secular emperor with particular focus on the legal interactions between the dynastic and Buddhist laws.

Wuzong's persecution against Buddhism is named after his reign as Huichang Persecution (會昌滅佛), which was a wholesale suppression of Buddhism carried out between 840 and 846, culminating in the massive destruction of temples and laicization of monks and nuns in 845.[4] It is known as the only one amongst the four persecutions against Buddhism in China that encompassed the entire territory of the empire. The Huichang Persecution has aroused significant scholarly interests. Regarding the motivations of Wuzong, scholars have identified three aspects in general. Scholars such as Yu Furen (于辅

[1] Wang Pu, *Essential Records of Tang* 47.20, in *Chinese Text Project*, accessed 31 October 2025, https://ctext.org/wiki.pl?if=gb&chapter=603417&remap=gb#p21.
[2] Yang Jie, "Tang Wuzong Miefo yu Fojiao de Bentuhua Yanjiu" [The Study On The Destruction Of Buddhism By Tang Wuzong And the Localization Of Buddhism], *Journal of Handan University* 29, no. 2 (June 2019): 78. http://doi.org/CNKI:SUN:SZHD.0.2019-02-012.
[3] Rupert Gethin, *The Foundations of Buddhism* (Oxford University Press, 1998), 116–8.
[4] Stanley Weinstein, *Buddhism Under the T'ang* (Cambridge University Press, 1987), 118–35.

仁) emphasizes the political rivalries between Wuzong and Xuanzong (宣宗) and argues that the persecution was mainly triggered by the rumour that Xuanzong was hiding in monasteries.[5] Represented by Li Wencai (李文才) and Tang Yongtong (汤用彤), some scholars highlight the role played by Wuzong's favourite subject, Li Deyu (李德裕), who was subscribed to Daoism and held consistent hostilities against Buddhism.[6] Also, a large number of scholars have contended that the major driver of the Huichang persecution was the economic competition between the court and the Buddhist institutions.[7]

This essay intervenes in the field by introducing the legal aspects into it, attempting to answer the question: how did the legal interaction between the court and Buddhism ultimately lead to Wuzong's denunciation and persecution of Buddhist laws as 'the most harmful of all'? It argues that the unfortunate fate of Buddhism during Huichang era was almost an inevitable consequence of the long-term interactions between the dynastic and Buddhist laws. The original laws laid out in Vinaya largely compromised its rigidness and sacredness to accommodate the local society in Tang, which allowed the monastics to engage in secular affairs and build corresponding networks at the expense of the increasingly blurred boundaries between laymen and monastics. Nonetheless, with or without intention, their secular engagement constituted competitions with and posed threats to the court and undermined the legitimacy of the dynastic laws. The long-accumulated tensions ultimately erupted during Huichang.

This essay's structure closely mirrors the decree cited above. Section I introduces the primary sources. Section II through V each addresses one of the decree's themes: 'exhaustion

[5] Yu Furen, "Tang Wuzong Miefo Yuanyin Xintan," [A New Exploration of the Reasons behind Wuzong of Tang's Persecution against Buddhism], *Yantai Normal University Journal (Philosophy and Social Sciences)* 3 (1991): 53–60. http://doi.org/10.20063/j.cnki.cn37-1452/c.1991.03.010.
[6] Li Wencai, *Suitang Zhengzhi yu Wenhua Yanjiu Lunwen Ji* [Collected Essays of Li Wencai on the Social and Cultural Study of Sui and Tang] ed. Wang Mingsun (Huamulan Wenhua Chubanshe, 2015), 506–15; Tang Yongtong, *Tang Yongtong Quanji Volume II* [Collected Essays of Tang Yongtong Volume II] eds. Wang Shuhua, et. al., (Hebei Renmin Chubanshe, 2000).
[7] Michael T. Dalby, "Court Politics in Late T'ang Times" in *The Cambridge History of China*, ed. Denis C. Twitchett (Cambridge University Press, 2008), 3: 667–9; Cao Lvning, "Lun Lideyu yu Huichangmiefo zhi guanxi" [The Role Played by Li Deyu in Huichang Persecution: Comments on Drafts on Buddhism in Suitang], *Journal of Qinghai Normal University* (*Philosophy and Social Science Edition*) 3 (June, 1989): 55–8. https://doi.org/10.16229/j.cnki.issn1000-5102.1989.03.012.

of labours'; 'deprivation of wealth'; 'sowing discords'; and 'separation of spouses,' before concluding in Section VI.

I: Primary Sources

Despite other fragmentary documents excavated from Dunhuang and Turfan, certain contemporary literatures, and a few epitaphs that this essay may cite from other secondary sources, it mainly draws evidence from four groups of primary sources, which are listed below:

The T'ang Codes with Commentary (《唐律疏議》), the official laws of Tang dynasty, was composed by Zhangsun Wuji (長孫無忌), the brother-in-law of Tang Taizong (唐太宗) between 624 and 653 AD.[8] It was a compilation of normative rules regulating people's behaviours, including the Codes (律), the statute (令), the regulation (格), and the ordinance (式).[9] It was still in use during Huichang persecution.

The Old Book of Tang (《舊唐書》) is the official history of Tang dynasty composed during the Later Jin dynasty (936–47AD) under the commission of Emperor Gaozong of Later Jin and the supervision of Liu Xu (劉昫).[10] The Essential Records of Tang Dynasty (《唐會要》) was composed in Northern Song dynasty by Wang Pu (王溥) to record the imperial reformations in Tang dynasty in 961 AD.[11] The two provided detailed accounts of the politics, culture, and institutions in Tang dynasty, and the large amount of Royal Decrees collected within are particularly relevant to this essay.

The most prominently used Buddhist law during Tang dynasty was the *Sifenlv Shanfan Buque Xingshi Chao* (《四分律刪繁補缺行事抄》SSBXC hereafter), which is a systematic compilation of Buddhist regulations by Daoxuan (道宣) based on the

[8] *The T'ang Code, Volume I: General Principles*, trans. Johnson Wallace (Princeton University Press, 1979), 8–10.
[9] Ibid.
[10] Liu Xu, et. al, *Jiu Tangshu*, [The Old Book of Tang], in Chinese Text Project, accessed 31 October 2025, https://ctext.org/wiki.pl?if=gb&res=456206&remap=gb.
[11] Wang, *Essential Records of Tang,* in *Chinese Text Project*.

fifth-century translation of Dharmaguptaka-Vinaya with supplements of many quotations from many other Vinayas and scriptures.[12] Because it is still controversial which version of Vinaya was the basis for the original translation, this essay goes to the generally-agreed earliest version, the Pali text Bhikkhu-Patimokkha for reference and comparison.[13]

The fourth is *Ennin's Diary: The Record of a Pilgrimage to China in Search of the Law* (《入唐求法巡禮行記》), which is a travelogue written by Ennin, a Japanese monk who pilgrimaged to Tang China between 838 and 847. It provided a vivid account to observe how Huichang Persecution was carried out.[14]

II: 'Exhaustion of Labour'

A. Monks and Nuns

Examining the biography of Li Deyu, one of the most important advocators of the persecution, this essay discovers that he consistently attacked Buddhism throughout his career. His most eloquent speech was delivered in 824, where he claimed: 'I heard that in Sizhou, if a household has three sons, one will be sent to monasteries to avoid corvee labours and to acquire tax exemption for the household's assets…if no prohibition against such practices is issued, our emperor will lose sixty thousand labourers in the south of Jiang and Huai.'[15] The number was probably not Li's exaggeration. According to Essential Records of Tang, the total number of laicized monks and nuns reached 265,000.[16] Of all the territories under the Tang, imperial persecution was especially intense in the Jiang and Huai regions.[17]

---

[12] Daoxuan, *Sifenlv Shanfanbuque Xingshichao* (Dharma-gupta-vinaya Rules, T. No.1804); Chengzhong Pu, "Slaves (nubi 奴婢)' in Daoxuan's Vinaya Writings," *Studies in Chinese Religions* 2, no.1(2016): 19. https://doi.org/10.1080/23729988.2016.1153291.
[13] Bhikkhu Nanatusita, *Analysis of the Bhikkhu Patimokkha* (Buddhist Publication Society, 2014).
[14] Ennin, *Ennin's Diary: The Record of a Pilgrimage to China in Search of the Law*, trans. Edwin O. Reischauer (Ronald Press Company, 1955).
[15] Liu, *The Old Book of Tang*, 178.19.
[16] Wang, *Essential* 84.34.
[17] You Li, "Lun Anshizhiluan he Huichang Miefo dui Tang Youzhou Fojiao de Yingxiang–Yi <Datang YUnju Si Gu Sizhu Lv Dade Shendao Beiming Bingxiu> wei Zhongxin," [The Impact of the An Lushan Rebellion and the Huichang Suppression of Buddhism on Buddhism in Youzhou during the Tang Dynasty: A Study Centered on the *Stele Inscription and Preface for Vinaya Master, Former Abbot of Yunju Monastery of the Great Tang*] *Chinese Social History Review* 16 (2015): 10.

Given that Li had personally been to Sizhou, this essay regards the number as approximately accurate.

What Li was condemning was the phenomenon that some people took the imperial grant of tax and corvee labour exemption over monastics as a legal loophole to secure advantages for themselves. The sheer number quoted above could demonstrate the severity of this issue. However, noteworthily, the imperial grant of exemption entailed prices for Buddhism. In fact, Buddhist laws largely compromised their independence in exchange for the grant. To a significant degree, they lost their autonomy to admit new inmates because of the exemption. For the exemptions to be granted to a certain individual, the individual in question had to be registered and to some extent, selected by the granter, which was exactly what happened between the Buddhist community and Tang court. The T'ang Code with Commentaries Article 154.1a clearly regulated that 'in all cases of unauthorized ordainment as a Buddhist Priest, both the person who was ordained as well as the person who performed the ordainment were punishable by 100 blows with the heavy stick.[18] Also, the sub-commentary stated that once sentenced to be laicized, one was deprived of the rights of wearing religious clothes, and the violation of this regulation also entailed 100 blows with the heavy stick.[19] The certificate issued by the court in expression of the imperial approval to one's ordinance was named 'Dudie (度牒).' The Essential Records of Tang reported that in May 846 the emperor Wuzong issued a Royal Decree to entitle the Department of Ci (祠部) to distribute Dudie when necessary.[20] Even the Buddhist laws compiled by Daoxuan were clear about this, as he laid out the initial screening criteria for the ordination as 'secretly ordaining those without the consent of their parents or the permission of the king's laws is a serious breach of the Vinaya rules.'[21] Therefore, the admission of new monks and nuns was largely regulated by the dynastic, instead of the Buddhist laws, which implied the

[18] *The T'ang Code, Volume II: Specific Articles*, trans. Wallace Johnson (Princeton University Press, 1979), 128.
[19] Ibid., 128–9.
[20] Wang, *Essential*, 49.7.
[21] T. No. 1804, 40–3: 149c22–24.

superiority of the dynastic over the Buddhist laws. This was a dramatic adaptation of the original Vinaya text. As in the section 'Unqualified Persons,' the Pali text focused purely on the evaluation of one's morality, and the religious institutions were responsible for the evaluation.[22] Just like Buddha himself, the process of ordainment shall be an enlightenment instead of an examination.[23] It is then fair to argue that it was initially a compromise made by Buddhist laws to transfer its right to ordain new inmates in exchange for the exemption. The transference of the power to ordain new inmates to the secular court became troublesome during and after the Anlushan Rebellion (755–63), since the Court publicly engaged in the business of selling Dudie to enrich the treasury, which meant selling a certificate for the exemption from corvee-labour and taxation.[24] For example, during Suzong's (肅宗) reign (756–62), the court "placed altars in large scale to sell Dudie; those who wished to be ordained had to pay 100 guan of 'Xiangshui' money."[25] Since the establishment of the precedents, such practices continued to spread amongst local officials and proved extremely difficult to eradicate despite repeated prohibitions later on.[26] 70 years later, Wenzong (文宗) was still trying to regulate such practices with Royal Decrees, but with little effect, as the monasteries continued to expand dramatically throughout the century.[27] Scholars such as Wei Chengsi has estimated that in the mid-ninth century, the number of the ordained (exempted from corvee-labour and taxation) reached 700,000 whereas the number of households paying taxes was approximately 3,000,000.[28]

Subsequent compromises within Buddhist law further eroded the boundaries between lay and monastic communities. Due to the apparent pragmatic instead of ideological reasons for people's ordainment and the limited accommodation capacity of

[22] Nanatusita, *Analysis*, xcii.
[23] Rebecca Redwood French and Mark A. Nathan, "Introducing Buddhism and Law," in *Buddhism and Law*, ed. Rebecca Redwood French and Mark A. Nathan (Cambridge University Press, 2014), 3.
[24] Wei Chengsi, "Tangdai Jingji he Fojiao Xingshuai" [The Tang Economy and the Fluctuation of Buddhism], *The Voice of Dharma* 4, no. 4 (1988): 7. http://doi.org/10.16805/j.cnki.11-1671/b.1988.04.001.
[25] *Song Gaoseng Zhuan: Shenhui Zhuan*, cited in Wei, "Tangdai," 7.
[26] Ibid.
[27] Ibid., 8.
[28] Ibid.

monasteries, the special population of "nuns and monks staying at home" radically expanded until the persecution.[29] For example, an epitaph was discovered commemorating a "nun staying at home" named Zhi Zhixian, whose ordainment was out of purely pragmatic reasons, inferring from her quick conversion to Daoism immediately after the persecution.[30] Such practices drastically diverged from the original doctrine, as the Pali text rigidly demanded the physical isolation between monastics and laymen as laid out in the section 'Boundary (Sima).'[31] Therefore, the rapid expansion of Buddhism before the persecution was more a reaction towards the dynastic legal practices than an intentional aggression, and the expansion entailed the cost of blurred boundaries between the monastics and laymen.

Through the process of granting Dudie to those qualified for corvee-exemption, the dynastic laws established superiority over their Buddhist counterparts. The provisional laws legalizing the selling of Dudie facilitated the drastic expansion of Buddhist communities and to some extent forced the gradual dissolvement of boundaries between laymen and monastics. Therefore, the enlargement of the number of monastics was essentially the outcome of the aggression of the dynastic laws and the compromise of Buddhist laws.

B. Dependents

In a decree issued in 843, Wuzong announced that he had forced the laicization of approximately 265,000 monks and nuns, and about 150,000 slaves, which were to be enrolled into tax-rolls.[32] This was a rather awkward expression, because neither the Buddhist laws nor the dynastic laws defined these people as 'slaves.' The only reference this essay could find in the original text denoting the monastics' use of servants was in the passage "The training precept on the king," in which the symbol of the secular world, a robe sent by the king, had to be transferred to the monastics via the hands of a veyyavaccakaro (steward)

[29] Ping Yao, "A Nun Who Lived through the Huichang Persecution of Buddhism," in *Chinese Funerary Biographies: An Anthology of Remembered Lives*, ed. Patricia Buckley. Ebrey, Ping Yao, and Cong Ellen Zhang (University of Washington Press, 2019), 76.
[30] Ibid., 76.
[31] Nanatusita, *Analysis*, ixxxix–xci.
[32] Wang, *Essential,* 84.34.

or a kappiya-karaka (servant).[33] Probably extended from this exception, Daoxuan's SSBXC allowed the monastics to use the labour of two groups of people: Jingren (pure persons) and Jiaren (family)—both were lay workforce of the Buddhist monastery—though in none of his writings did he define them.[34] The reasons behind the permission was that though monastics were prohibited by Vinaya rules to approach activities or stuffs which were "unpure," these activities or stuffs would be necessary in real life, and thus certain laypeople could be employed to do the 'dirty works' for the monastics.[35] Though scholars generally agree that the status of those individuals in monasteries was parallel to secular slaves, rarely if ever, did the word 'slaves (nubi, 奴婢)' explicitly appear in documents produced by monastics themselves.

The problems arose again from the legal interactions between Buddhist and dynastic laws. The T'ang Code divided the population into three legal statuses: commoners, personal retainers, and slaves, with clear boundaries set between them.[36] Clearly, monastic institutions used some secular slaves as servants. As the 843 decree announced, the persecuting authorities returned some slaves to their original masters or, if those masters were no longer alive, turned them over to the government for sale.[37] However, a great number of evidence demonstrates that prior to the persecution, monasteries made use of not only slaves but also commoners and personal retainers as *jingren* and *jiaren*. For example, in 840, when Bai Juyi was building the Sutra-Collection Hall of Xiangshan Temple, he recorded his encounter with 7 Jingren who voluntarily dedicated themselves to monasteries.[38] The word 'voluntarily' indicated that they were commoners before entering the monastery. Despite the fact that the court was clearly aware of the mixture of commoners and slaves amongst the population of jingren and jiaren, Wuzong's decree

[33] Nanatusita, *Analysis*, 129.
[34] Pu, "Slaves," 28–9.
[35] T. No. 1804, 40–2: 81c10, 82c5–16.32.
[36] *The T'ang Code, Volume I*, 28.
[37] Weinstein, *Buddhism Under the T'ang*, 119.
[38] Bai Juyi, 'Records in Building Xiangshan Temple,' in *Gushiwen*, https://www.gushiwen.cn/shiwenv.aspx?id=e591ee6e67f1 (accessed 31 October 2025).

simply adopted the word 'slaves' to refer to the jiaren and jingren in monasteries, which revealed the fact that the nature of the services provided by those people was regarded as equal to slavery. It also reflected an implicit anxiety of the emperor over the blurred boundary between the three different legal statuses in the monasteries that were in close contact with the secular society, as he himself could not think of a more appropriate word to characterize the dependent population.

The threats posed by the monasteries' practices of recruiting jingren and jiaren to the court were thus twofold: firstly, the commoners who might have served as corvée-labours and taxpayers instead became dependents of monasteries, offering their labour in return for the livelihood and protection from the monasteries, thereby depriving the court of potential opportunity to extract revenues from them; secondly, the monasteries' recruitment of jingren and jiaren disrupted the legal hierarchy of identities established by The T'ang Code. Therefore, to adapt to Tang society, Buddhist laws made major compromises by recruiting large numbers of laymen as servants, blurring the boundary between monastics and laity. This undermined the secular legal order by hindering the emperor's ability to mobilize his subjects and disrupting the status hierarchy established by The T'ang Code.

III: 'Deprivation of Wealth in Adoration of Temples'

The economic motivations were nonnegligible in driving the persecution. Ennin in his diary recalled a decree issued by Wuzong in the tenth month of 842 highlighting that all properties of those refusing to be laicized would be confiscated.[39] At that time, the cultivatable lands owned by the Buddhist community reached the size of 40,000 hectares (4% of the total cultivatable lands of the empire).[40] Also, scholars estimate that the annual expenditure of a small temple was roughly 200,000 wen; a large temple's annual expenditure

[39] Ennin, *Ennin's Diary*, 382–3.
[40] Dong Xiaojia, "Baizhanting huihuaishengxiangyundong yu Tangwuzong Huichangmiefo Yitong Chutan" [A Comparison Study of the Iconoclasm in Byzantium and the Demolishing of the Buddhism during the Hui Chang Period in Tang Dynasty], *Journal of Mianyang Normal University* 29, no.12 (December 2010): 50. Http://doi.org//10.16276/j.cnki.cn51-1670/g.2010.12.008.

constituted no more than 1/3 of its cash reserve.[41] Therefore, the seizure of monastics' properties meant large enrichment of the treasury.

However, despite the economic gains acquired through enlistment into tax-rolls and confiscations, the Court had one particular concern: the acquisition of the precious metals worked to decorate temples.

A brutally vivid image of destruction was depicted in Ennin's diary entry of the sixteenth-day-of-the-eighth-moon in 845: "they have peeled off the gold from the Buddhas and smashed the bronze and iron Buddhas and measured their weight. What a pity!" Before that, on the twenty-eighth-day-of-the-sixth-moon, he recorded witnessing an imperial order's arrival ordering all the bronze and iron Buddhas to be smashed, weighed, and handed over to the Salt and Iron Bureau.[42] The swift enforcement of the Order was probably because it had been planned long before the persecution. The Essential Record of Tang collected a Royal Decree issued in 824, declaring that all activities of melting coins to build Buddhist images shall receive the same punishment as privately minting coins.[43] According to Tang Code 391.1a, the punishment was life exile for 3,000 li.[44] Therefore, instead of a purely lucrative plunder, the Huichang confiscation of temple gold should be understood as an outcome of a long-standing tension between the court and Buddhist monasteries over precious metals.

The early text set clear prohibitions against monastics handling precious metals. As regulated in 'The Training Precept on Silver': if any bhikkhu should take gold and silver, or should have it taken, or should consent to it being deposited for him, this involved expiation and with forfeiture.[45] When Daoxuan compiled the SSBXC in the seventh century, Buddhism had been rooted in China for centuries.[46] At that time it had become evident that practices of handling precious metals had flourished amongst monastics, and Daoxuan,

[41] Ibid.
[42] Ennin, *Ennin's Diary*, 373.
[43] Wang, *Essential,* 89.24.
[44] *The T'ang Code, Volume II,* 457.
[45] Nanatusita, *Analysis,* 145.
[46] Yao, 'A Nun,' 75.

though dissatisfied with such practices, amended the text by expressly acknowledging the monastery's collective ownership of precious metals—a form of recognition that has no identifiable parallel in the Pali text examined in this essay.[47]

S.E. Grafton has noted the sacred and immortal qualities of gold in religious literature around the world to explain the almost universal phenomenon of golden decoration of religious items.[48] However, in the Tang dynasty, the lavishness of golden temples had another specific reason—the numerous imperial patronages.[49] A great number of artifacts were excavated from the underground palace of Famen Temple in today's Xi'an in 1987, and a stone monument at its entrance recorded a series of imperial donations made before 874, amongst which 129 were made of precious metals.[50] At the heyday of Tang's economic strength, the court formulated a friendly relationship with the Buddhist community. Empress Wu (r.690–705) even openly proclaimed herself as cakravartin (universal Buddhist sovereign).[51] Also, in 818/819, Xianzong(宪宗) held a grand ceremony to receive another Buddha's relic, which he claimed had blessed him a victory.[52] It is then fair to conclude that throughout the Tang dynasty before the persecution, imperial donations of precious metals and patronage over constructions of grand images were prominent, and in most ceremonies, the most high-ranked monastics had to be present to pay respect to the crown. In response to the imperial generosity, the monastic law further compromised its sacredness, placing itself at an even more inferior position. A Xuzhou Official named Wang Zhixin, proposed to build a lavish altar in celebration of the birthday of the newly crowned

[47] T. No. 1804, 40–2: 55c26–28, 57b18–19, 57c6–7, 57c19–20.
[48] S.E. Grafton, *Human History* (London Jonathan Cape Ltd, 1934), 313–4.
[49] Anna Sokolova, "Building and Rebuilding Buddhist Monasteries in Tang China: The Reconstruction of the Kaiyuan Monastery in Sizhou," *Religions* 12, no.4 (April, 2021): 253. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel12040253.
[50] Regina Knaller and Florian Ströbele, "The Heritage of Tang Dynasty Textiles from the Famen Temple," *Studies in Conservation* 59, no.1 (2014): S62. https://doi.org.eux.idm.oclc.org/10.1179/204705814X13975704317912.
[51] Hung I-Fang, "Lun Famensi Tangdai M <Yiwuzhang>zhongde Getiliangci," [Individual Classifiers in a Tang Dynasty "Articles Tablet" at Famen Temple], *Chinese Studies* 24, no.2 (December 2005): 139.
[52] Liu, *The Old Book of Tang* 15.61.

emperor Jingzong to apply for funding.[53] Such practices further undermined the rigidity of Buddhist laws by blurring the boundary between laymen and monastics.

Clearly, the second charge levelled against Buddhism by Wuzong referred to the massive wealth possessed by the monasteries, especially the numerous precious metals used in adoration of temples which the court desperately needed. Nonetheless, turning back the clock, the Buddhist laws largely compromised their rigidity to accommodate the Tang society, particularly in their interactions with the imperial court. The reworked texts acknowledged the practice of monasteries collectively possessing precious metals; monks accompanied secular rulers to receive holy relics; and officials sometimes proposed to build Buddhist altars to celebrate an emperor's birth. The massive imperial patronages and involvement in building and adorning the temples illustrated that the lavish decoration of the temples at the time of Huichang was more an outcome of the monasteries' inevitable interaction with the imperial power than their intentional agenda. However, the reasonings mattered for historians, not for Wuzong; the gold, silver, and bronze on Buddha's bodies were sufficiently attractive for him to persecute.

IV. 'Sowed Discords between Emperor and his Subjects, Parents and their Children'

The third accusation put against Buddhism by Wuzong cited above referred to the monastic role in education. Because Huichang was an imperial persecution, this section centres on unravelling the process of how Buddhist laws 'sowed discords between the emperor and his subjects.'

The original Pali text indeed intensively discussed Buddhist education, but most of the discussions referred to the teachings of sutra recital strictly within monasteries, from senior to young monks.[54] There was only one exception mentioned in the introduction implying that possibly on some specific days, the monastics would assemble to teach the

[53] Liu Yimin, "Local Perspectives on Monastic Practices in the Jianghuai Region during the Mid-to-Late Tang Period," *Religions* 16, no.6 (June 2025): 783. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel16060781.
[54] See Nanatusita, *Analysis*, 78, 170–3, 353.

laity about the Buddhist doctrines.[55] Such rigidness had largely disappeared in the Buddhist laws in Tang dynasty. Probably because since Buddhism arrived in China it had shouldered some charitable responsibilities, in the text translated in the fifth century (Sifenlv四分律), the Buddhist laws compromised to allow monastics to take orphans into monasteries as 'crow-chasers (quwu 驱乌)' to perform the lightest menial tasks.[56] It is generally agreed among scholars that the practices of admitting 'boys (tongzi 童子)' and 'practicants (xingzhe 行者)' during Tang dynasty evolved from this tradition.[57] The two were together called postulants who stood halfway between the sacred and secular: they could keep their hairs; they observed the laymen's Five Rules instead of the novice's Ten Rules; but they lived in monasteries, received Buddhist education, and provided services for the monasteries.[58] The requirement for them to be accepted as a novice was the minimum of one-year service for the monasteries.[59] Daoxuan's attitude towards such practices was ambiguous, because despite the clear presence of such practices before the seventh century, his SSBXC did not mention them. It was only in the late eleventh century that the statuses of these groups were clarified.[60] Given the fact that Daoxuan expressly condemned some other "corrupted behaviours" of the monastics, his silence over this issue may imply his acquiescence, which itself manifested a legal compromise of Buddhism.

Due to the early age of some postulants, the monasteries had to provide not only the classic Buddhist education, but also some basic literary education. An abundance of writing exercises were found in Dunhuang (e.g., P3114, S5491, S2703 in Appendix) based on the copy of 'One Thousand Characters' (qianziwen 千字文), which was known as an early education textbook in China.[61] The affordable and high-quality education provided by the monasteries attracted many lay students, who had no intention to be ordained but wished to

[55] Ibid., 4.
[56] T. 1428 (sifenlv) 810.c, cited in Erik Zürcher, *Buddhism in China: Collected Papers of Erik* Zürcher, ed. Jonathan A. Silk (Brill, 2013), 307.
[57] Ibid., 309.
[58] Kenneth Ch'en, *Buddhism in China* (Princeton University Press, 1964), 245.
[59] Ibid.
[60] Zürcher, *Buddhism in China*, 308.
[61] Ibid., 314–8.

be taught in the monasteries. Some name-lists found in Dunhuang suggested that a large proportion of 'students' in Tang monasteries remained laypeople throughout their lives, which phenomenon dramatically intensified since the ninth century.[62] A Chinese scholar, Yan Gengwang (严耕望) conducted a detailed research on the biographies of Tang celebrities, and he listed more than 200 instances in which individuals who would later become prominent generals, poets or administrators declared that they had studied in Buddhist monasteries in early years.[63] For example, Li Zhi (李騭), who later became the imperial courtier, had spent 3 years in Huishan Monastery at Wuxi around 830.[64] Noteworthily, in his biography, he claimed that he had studied not only the Buddhist doctrines and literary skills, but also some Confucious classics, including Shiji (史記), Hanshu (漢書); Zhuangzi (莊子); Han Feizi (韓非子), and Li Sao (離騷). Up until then, the monastics' practices not only compromised the Buddhist laws, but directly contradicted it, since they were actively teaching and advocating secular writings rather than merely receiving them.

The monastic engagement with secular education was indeed an extremely dangerous practice, and signalled a threat to the Tang court. Firstly, the monastic education was in direct competition with the state-sponsored institutions—Xiangxue (鄉學) in local regions. Two ninth-century Buddhist biographies for Niu Yun (牛雲) and Chang Jue (常覺) explicitly mentioned that the two monks became 'boys' because they despised the education of Xiangxue and wanted to quit it.[65] Such open competition undoubtedly aroused worries for the court. Secondly, the monastic involvement in education challenged the core value and essential principle of the dynastic laws. In Chapter 1 of The T'ang Code, the phrase "governmental teachings" appeared simultaneously in the beginning (1a) and in the end (11b) of the first five pages laying out the guiding principles.[66] In another words, the entire

[62] Ibid.
[63] Yan Gengwang, *Tangshi Yanjiu Conggao* [Draft of Research on Tang History] (New Asia Institute of Advanced Chinese Studies, 1969), 374.
[64] Zürcher, *Buddhism in China*, 329.
[65] Ibid., 323.
[66] *The T'ang Code, Volume I*, 49, 54.

Tang Code started by stating that 'no penal laws were promulgated except in accord with the moral teachings concerning government,' and ended by declaring that 'virtue and ritual are the basis of governmental teaching; punishment and chastisements are the instruments of governmental teaching.' The T'ang Code thus made it crystal clear that governmental teaching was the core of the entire dynastic legal system. The laws were nothing more than instruments to educate people to be qualified subjects of the imperial government, which was deemed to be the prerogative of the secular world and had to be controlled by the court. The monastic involvement then undoubtedly triggered significant imperial anxieties.

Proceeding from the above two points, most importantly, the engagement with education allowed the monasteries to cultivate political networks and intervene in secular politics. Yan's list of more than 200 prominent individuals who had studied in monasteries was striking because he only counted those significant enough to have their own biographies, which meant that a large portion of important politicians had been influenced by Buddhist education, and thus it was legitimate for the Crown to worry about potential monastic manipulation of secular politics, especially if he himself was not subscribed to Buddhism. One of the triggers of the persecution was the rumour that Wuzong's rival, Xuanzong, was hiding in monasteries, given that Xuanzong had frequently visited scenic monasteries in his youth (at that time, this was synonymous to having received certain monastic education).[67] No matter whether the rumour was true or not, the important fact is that Wuzong regarded it as possible, which meant that monastics had clearly forged threatening political networks at that time. For now, they had diverged dramatically from the doctrinal text demanding isolation from the secular world.

All of this began with Buddhist laws' compromise and acquiescence. It began probably as a pragmatic or charitable effort to secure a foothold in the local society for Buddhist monasteries to shelter and educate lay orphans; this practice gradually grew beyond control, developing into formulations of vast educational networks capable of

[67] Weinstein, *Buddhism Under the T'ang,* 137.

manipulating politics. Via education, Buddhist laws posed fundamental threats to the dynastic laws, and the latter then relied on the ultimate source of power in a traditional society—the imperial power—to destroy its enemy. The Huichang persecution was the last domino to fall after prolonged hostilities.

V. 'Separation of Spouses'

The last accusation fell on the role played by Buddhist laws to destroy marriages, which was easy to understand at first sight, because Buddhist laws were well-known for advocating celibacy. Placed as the third of the eight precepts, a monastic 'abandons non-celibacy… abstaining from the sexual vulgar act.'[68] Nonetheless, Wuzong referred to not only this, but also that the refined Buddhist laws accommodated an alternative option for women in the Tang dynasty, which largely undermined the authority of the dynastic laws and the "governmental teachings."

In Daoxuan's reworked version of Vinaya, monks were allowed to provide deathbed comforts and funerary services for laymen, which provision this essay did not find a parallel in the early text. As laid out in SSBXC's Chapter on 'Attending to the Sick and Caring for the Dead,' he specifically detailed two burial approaches described in the Vinaya: cremation (fire burial) and forest exposure.[69] This was problematic since it directly contradicted The T'ang Code, which regulated that 'if a corpse is burned, the punishment is three years of penal servitude.'[70] The more problematic issue was that such Buddhist laws attracted a group of prominent women, and their embracement of the burial-approach according to Buddhist laws entailed their refusal to be buried with their husbands, which violated one of the fundamental values underlying the dynastic laws: the reinforcement of the harmony between Yin (wife) and Yang (husband).[71] A large corpus of epitaphs commemorating

[68] Nanatusita, *Analysis*, 64.
[69] T. No. 1804, 141: a14–b10.
[70] *The T'ang Code, Volume I,* 271–2.
[71] Ibid., 14.

deceased women from the Tang dynasty reveals that these women explicitly expressed a desire to have their bodies separated from their husbands in burial, citing their belief in Buddhist law.[72] For example, in the 'Epitaph Inscription and Preface for the Lady Magistrate Du, Warehouse Official in the Leading Guard in the Great Tang' were the following words: As a Buddhist devotee, his wife refused the traditional Confucian couple burial, but chose the Buddhist stupa burial…People moved the grave to the side of the stupa in accordance to her will.[73] Such practices aroused significant resentment. For example, Bai Juyi, writing in the mid-eighth century, authored enormous poems to reinforce the Confucious tradition of couple-burial, such as "(Me and my wife) Alive are intimate roommates; dead are dusts in the same tomb."[74]

For this essay's purpose, it is then fair to establish that given the prominence of the women's identities and the flourishment of such practices, the practices of women's burials according to Buddhist laws constituted a disruption to traditional marriage practices and corresponding dynastic laws, which probably was the foundation of Wuzong's last charge against Buddhist law, though the refined Buddhist law itself was initially a result of interactions with the local society.

Section VI: Conclusion

Through an in-depth analysis of the implications behind the words of Wuzong's Decree on persecuting Buddhists, this essay finds that throughout Buddhist law's interactions with the local societies and dynastic powers in Tang dynasty, the Buddhist aws largely compromised their rigidity and sacredness with the boundary between laymen and monastics largely blurred. Daoxuan reworked the Vinaya to accommodate the imperial intervention into ordainment, to allow the de-facto employment of slaves, to legitimize the

[72] Jiang Aihua and Lang Lang, "The Buddhist Impact on the Last Testaments of Women in Medieval China," *Religions* 13, no.11 (2022): 1080. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel13111076.
[73] Ibid., 1079.
[74] Ibid., 1083.

monasteries' collective ownership of precious metals, to shelter and educate laypeople, and to provide funerary services to secular individuals.

Unfortunately, the more efforts the Buddhists put into adapting their laws, the more threatening they were in the court's eyes because the secularization of Buddhist laws entailed growing challenges to dynastic laws' authority. Over time, Buddhist law increasingly positioned itself in comprehensive competition with dynastic law, with some provisions largely undermining the authority of the latter. The Huichang Persecution was an eruption of the prolonged tensions arising from the interactions between two incompatible legal systems. The dynastic laws relied on imperial power to eliminate their religious rival.

Bibliography

Bai, Juyi. "Records in Building Xiangshan Temple." *Gushiwen*. Accessed 31 October 2025. https://www.gushiwen.cn/shiwenv.aspx?id=e591ee6e67f.

Cao, Lvning. "Lun Li Deyu yu Huichang Miefo zhi Guanxi—Du 'Suitang Fojiao Shigao' Zhaji." [The Role Played by Li Deyu in Huichang Persecution—Comments on "The History of Buddhism in Sui and Tang Dynasty"]. *Journal of Qinghai Normal University (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition)* 3 (June 1989): 55–8. https://doi.org/10.16229/j.cnki.issn1000-5102.1989.03.012.

Dalby, Michael. T. "Court Politics in Late T'ang Times." In *The Cambridge History of China*. Edited by Denis C. Twitchett. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Daoxuan. *Sifenlv Shanfan Buque Xingshi Chao.* [Dharma-gupta-vinaya Rules]. T. No. 1804.

Dong, Xiaojia. "Baizhanting Huihuai Shengxiang Yundong yu Tang Wuzong Huichang Miefo Yitong Chutan." [A Comparison Study of the Iconoclasm in Byzantium and the Demolishing of the Buddhism during the Hui Chang Period in Tang Dynasty]. *Journal of Mianyang Normal University* 29, no.12 (December 2010): 49–52. Http://doi.org//10.16276/j.cnki.cn51-1670/g.2010.12.008.

Ennin. *Ennin's Diary: The Record of a Pilgrimage to China in Search of the Law.* Translated by Edwin O. Reischauer. Ronald Press Company, 1955.

French, Rebecca Redwood and Mark A. Nathan. "Introducing Buddhism and Law." In *Buddhism and Law: An Introduction*. Edited by Rebecca Redwood French and Mark A. Nathan. Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Gethin, Rupert. *The Foundations of Buddhism.* Oxford University Press, 1998.

Hung, I-Fang. "Lun Famensi Tangdai <Yiwuzang> zhong de Geti Liangci." [Individual Classifiers in a Tang Dynasty "Articles Tablet" at Famen Temple]. *Chinese Studies* 24, no.2 (December 2005): 135–70.

Jiang, Aihua and Lang Lang. "The Buddhist Impact on the Last Testament of Women in Medieval China." *Religions* 13, no. 11 (November 2022): 1076–89. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel13111076.

Johnson, Wallace. "General Principles of the T'ang Code." In *The T'ang Code Volume I: General Principles*, edited and translated by Wallace Johnson. Princeton University Press, 1979.

Knaller, Regina and Florian Ströbele. "The Heritage of Tang Dynasty Textiles from the Famen Temple." *Studies in Conversation* 59, no. 1 (2014): S62–S65. https://doi.org.eux.idm.oclc.org/10.1179/204705814X13975704317912.

Li, Wencai. *Suitang Zhengzhi yu Wenhua Yanjiu Lunwen Ji*. [Collected Essays of Li Wencai on the Social and Cultural Study of Sui and Tang]. Edited by Wang Mingsun. Huamulan Wenhua Chubanshe: 2015.

Liu, Yimin. "Local Perspectives on Monastic Practices in the Jianghuai Region during the Mid-to-Late Tang Period: Ordination Altars, Social Networks, and the Cult of Sengqie僧伽." *Religions* 16, no. 6 (June 2025): 781–802.

Natatusita, Bhikkhu. *Analysis of the Bhikkhu Patimokkha.* Buddhist Publication Society, 2014.

Pu, Chengzhong. "Slaves (*nubi*奴婢) in Daoxuan's Vinaya Writings." *Studies in Chinese Religion* 2, no. 1 (2016): 18–44. https://doi.org/10.1080/23729988.2016.1153291.

Smith, Grafton Elliot. *Human History.* Jonathan Cape, 1934.

Sokolova, Anna. "Building and Rebuilding Buddhist Monasteries in Tang China: The Reconstruction of the Kaiyuan Monastery in Suzhou." *Religions* 12, no. 4 (April 2021): 253–67. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel12040253.

The T'ang Code, Volume I: General Principles. Translated by Wallace Johnson. Princeton University Press, 1979.

The T'ang Code, Volume II: Specific Articles. Translated by Wallace Johnson. Princeton University Press, 1997.

Tang, Yongtong. *Tang Yongtong Quanji Volume II*. [Collected Essays of Tang Yongtong Volume II]. Edited by Wang Shuhua, et. al. Hebei Renmin Chubanshe, 2000.

Wang, Fu. Essential Records of Tang. Chinese Text Project. Accessed 31 October 31 2025. https://ctext.org/wiki.pl?if=gb&res=243258&remap=gb.

Wei, Chengsi. "Tangdai Jinji he Fojiao Xingshuai." [The Tang Economy and the Fluctuations of Buddhism]. *The Voice of Dharma* 4, no. 4 (1988): 4–9. http://doi.org/10.16805/j.cnki.11-1671/b.1988.04.001.

Weinstein, Stanley. *Buddhism Under the T'ang.* Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Yan, Gengwang. *Tangshi Yanjiu Conggao*. [Draft of Research on Tang History]. New Asia Institute of Advanced Chinese Studies, 1969.

Yang, Jie. "Tang Wuzong Miefo yu Fojiao de Bentuhua Yanjiu." []. *Journal of Handan University* 29, no. 2 (June 2019): 78–83. http://doi.org/CNKI:SUN:SZHD.0.2019-02-012.

Yao, Ping. "A Nun Who Lived Through the Huichang Persecution of Buddhism." In *Chinese Funerary Biographies: An Anthology of Remembered Lives*. Edited by Patricia Buckley Ebre, Ping Yao, and Cong Ellen Zhang. University of Washington Press, 2019.

You, Li. "Lun Anshizhiluan he Huichang Miefo dui Tang Youzhou Fojiao de Yingxiang–Yi <Datang Yunju Si Gu Sizhu Lv Dade Shendao Beiming Bingxiu> wei Zhongxin" [The Impact of the An Lushan Rebellion and the Huichang Suppression of Buddhism on Buddhism in Youzhou during the Tang Dynasty: A Study Centered on the *Stele Inscription and Preface for Vinaya Master, Former Abbot of Yunju Monastery of the Great Tang*]. Chinese Social History Review 16 (2015): 1–21.

Yu, Feren. "Tang Wuzong Miefo Yuanyin Xintan." [A New Exploration of the Reasons behind Wuzong of Tang's Persecution against Buddhism] *Yantai University Journal (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition)* 3 (1991): 53–60. http://doi.org/10.20063/j.cnki.cn37-1452/c.1991.03.010.

Zürcher, Erik. *Buddhism in China: Collected Papers of Erik Zürcher*. Edited by Jonathan A. Silk. Brill, 2013.

Taking Flight: How the Czechoslovak Squadrons in the British Royal Air Force Legitimized Early Czechoslovak Government-In-Exile Efforts in Britain (1939–1940)

Adriana Bilenky
Dartmouth College

Photograph taken by author

Introduction

In Dr. Edvard Beneš' 1940 speech "Our Struggle for the Liberation of the Republic" delivered to the State Council in London, the Tribute to Fallen Soldiers section concludes with the simple line "I especially pay tribute to all our fallen airmen." As a whole, the speech places weight on both soldiers and politicians as the backbone of the Czechoslovak government-in-exile which was based out of London during the Second World War.[1] In particular it highlights the prominence of airmen, who served in the Czechoslovak squadrons of the Royal British Air Force, and whose existence as an early and capable fighting force legitimized the political movement to recognize a Czechoslovak Provisional Government. The squadrons, although formed under a degree of political pressure from exiled Czechoslovak politicians, were established by the British more out of convenience and the spirit of Allied unity than a genuine need for a separate fighting entity, but regardless proved to be invaluable to the Czechoslovak case for governmental recognition. The Czechoslovak government-in-exile movement and the Czechoslovak Squadrons of the R.A.F. were linked so that neither could have existed in the forms that they did without the other.

The origins of both the Czechoslovak squadrons and the government-in-exile movement lie in the prelude to WWII. On September 30th, 1938, Neville Chamberlain, the British Prime Minister, negotiated the Munich Agreement with the leaders of Germany, France and Italy to permit the German annexation of the Sudetenland, a region of western Czechoslovakia. Czechoslovak officials were not consulted nor present for its creation, eventually accepting it after both military and diplomatic pressure. Chamberlain hoped that this decision would appease Nazi Germany's desire for a larger German homeland, and prevent another war on the scale of the First World War.

[1] All translations made while writing this paper are mine, and all errors are mine alone. Edvard Beneš, Printed Speech "Náš Boj O Osvobození Republiky: Řeč při Zahájení Prací Státní Rady" (11 December 1940), Folder 2, Box 3, Czechoslovak resistance in exile (1939–1945) LIS/3, Karl Lisicky Collection (1915–1948) at the School of Slavonic and East European Studies (SSEES) Library, University of London. [hereafter known as LIS]

Internal British Foreign Office documents suggest that many viewed Czechoslovakia as an "artificial creation" of the previous conflict and maintaining its unity at risk of war was inadvisable—a position Chamberlain ended up agreeing with.[2] Even before Munich Agreement negotiations began, Czechoslovakia was aware of its tenuous position, particularly in the form of the rising German threat. Germany made it no secret that it desired to incorporate the Sudetenland, which was inhabited by a mixture of ethnic Germans and Czechs, into itself, and in response the Czechs began an accelerating campaign of military mobilization and defense buildup. As early as 1935, Czechoslovakia fortified and created a heavily armed western border with Germany, and began to increase its military spending. In 1938, after the Austrian annexation, this truly accelerated, with a partial mobilization of the military on May 21st. Part of these preparations included truly heavy investment in the Czechoslovak Air Force. According to the 1938 Annual Report on Czechoslovakia by the British Foreign Office, on January 1st of that year it was a "good but small force" of somewhat outdated aircraft—but just nine months later by the end of September it grew by about 40%, added state-of-the-art bombers to its forces and was fully mobilized and war-ready.[3]

Many of these Czechoslovak pilots fled their country after its complete annexation in March of 1939, which split the nation into the Nazi Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia (the Czech portion of Czechoslovakia) and the Nazi client state of the Slovak Republic. They mostly fled through Poland into France where they served as foreign fighters in the French Foreign Legion until France too fell to the Nazis in 1940.[4]

In fact, Britain—and London specifically—emerged as the location of the future Czechoslovak government-in-exile led by Edvard Beneš, which had been operating out of

[2] Vít Smetana, *In the Shadow of Munich: British Policy towards Czechoslovakia from the Endorsement to the Renunciation of the Munich Agreement (1938–1942)*. (Karolinum Press, 2014), 44.
[3] Annual Report on Czechoslovakia (1938), Czechoslovakia: annual reports, 1936–1968 FO 470/13, British National Archives at Kew.
[4] Alan Brown, "The Czechoslovak Air Force in Britain, 1940–1945," PhD diss., University of Southampton, 1998, https://www-proquest-com.dartmouth.idm.oclc.org/dissertations-theses/czechoslovak-air-force-britain-1940-1945-bl/docview/898767016/se-2.

France until its fall. It was a staunchly anti-fascist group of politicians, with the explicit goal of overturning the Munich Agreement and regaining control over the homeland. Although they were recognized by the British and French governments as a National Committee relatively quickly, the political situation of their home country and their unusual position as an aspiring government-in-exile presented some challenges in recognition in France and later in the United Kingdom. In particular, less than a week after the Munich Agreement, Edvard Beneš resigned as President of the Republic and had gone into self-imposed exile, which put the Czechoslovaks in a different position than the many other countries and leaders seeking recognition in exile in London (like Poland, Norway, the Free French, the Netherlands, etc.), because all of their governments fled intact—with no formal resignations. Considering also that the Czechoslovak National Committee had little control over what was going on in their former territory—and that the country itself had been split in two—there were serious doubts about its legitimacy as a true government-in-exile. For this reason, it was of utmost importance to Beneš and the other politicians to have a stake in the creation and control of a military force allied with the British.

This government-in-exile would prove to have a mixed relationship with the British, but would be particularly politically interested in the creation and use of Czechoslovak Royal Air Force Squadrons. The RAF created the 310, 311 and 312 Czechoslovak Squadrons for Czechoslovak airmen starting in July of 1940. On one hand, the RAF likely created the squadrons because of the concentrated arrivals of capable airmen and because they served as symbols of Allied unity.[5] On the other hand, they likely continued to exist due to the persistence of Edvard Beneš and what would become the government-in-exile, which insisted on its citizens being able to fight on the front lines of the war and garner prestige and influence for the group as a governing force.

For the Czechoslovak politicians, having an independent military fighting in WWII was a priority because of the legitimacy it would lend them. An important note is that the

[5] Ibid.

R.A.F. squadrons were not operationally independent, and due to their size, never became independent. However, this did not stop the Czechoslovak exiles from repeatedly and unsuccessfully pushing for it, and fighting for on-paper independence and the symbols that came with it during the establishment of these squadrons. From the British perspective, privately the Czechoslovak airmen were considered very skilled, but perhaps not a military necessity, and they viewed it to be easier if they were kept functionally as normal R.A.F. pilots. However, due to a mix of wanting to maintain cohesion amongst allies and the residual impacts of the Munich agreement, they allowed for a measure of on-paper independence.

I. Historiography and Methods

By far the most thorough previous scholarship on this topic is the work of Alan Brown in his PhD dissertation, "The Czechoslovak Air Force in Britain, 1940–1945" and subsequent book, *Airmen in Exile: The Allied Air Forces in the Second World War*. I hope that my work will serve as an expansion on it. He has a Beneš-focused view of the operations of the government-in-exile, and in his own words, “The central thesis is that the Czechoslovak Air Force in Britain was first and last a political tool to be used by the governments of both nations; first by the British as a means of international propaganda; then by the Czechoslovaks as a means of gaining prestige and influence while in exile; and last by the British again as a foil to the Soviets.” He aims to demonstrate that it was the arrival of the Czechoslovak troops and air crews which forced the British hand to legitimize a form of Czechoslovak government-in-exile and not some kind of sentimental compensation for Munich. He also details the Czechoslovak government-in-exile’s quest for an independent fighting force, which was a source of perpetual friction between the two allies. While he mentions the on-paper independence of the Czechoslovak fighting forces, he does not have it as the focus of his work, which is something I plan to explore further. I have, however, not found his claim of the British using the Czechoslovak forces as “international propaganda”

to be as prominent as he suggests, and will be analyzing their motivations for creating the squadrons as more circumstantial, and with a more military-focused lens.

In Milan Hauner's chapter of *Exile In and From Czechoslovakia During the 1930s and 1940s*, "Beginnings of the Czechoslovak Government in Exile 1939–1941," he asserts that the government-in-exile's politics and actions were dominated by its president Edvard Beneš, who he paints as a controversial figure. Nevertheless, he acknowledges him as a skilled and relentless politician who spent the time between the Munich Agreement and the war championing the idea of Czechoslovak continuity—that Czechoslovakia was a nation that still existed, and would form a government and legitimate fighting force in the event of an outbreak of war in Europe. His evidence comes in the form of Beneš' personal communications and political statements. Hauner asserts that Beneš' organization of the evacuation of Czech politicians and troops from France, particularly the transfer of the small but efficient Czech air force to the RAF, was an astute tactic that led to recognition of a Provisional Czechoslovak Government-in-exile shortly after, with him as the head. I expand on his work by incorporating larger political themes outside of just Beneš' goals, like the interplay between them and the British government's aims.

I have modeled my own research methods largely after Alan Brown's for his dissertation, with the caveat of only accessing sources in the United Kingdom. Therefore, my paper is told largely from the point of view of the British—both in what they were internally considering, and what they thought of Czechoslovak efforts. Most of the records that I accessed are held in the British National Archives at Kew. For obtaining a military administrative perspective, seeing as the Czechoslovak squadrons were at the command of British forces, I used the AIR archive, which contains the records of the Air Ministry, Royal Air Force and Air Historical Branch. For larger political and international relations insight, I used the records of the British Foreign Office, known as the FO Archive, also at Kew, which contains internal communications about foreign policy decisions on the British's part, but also records of communications between the British and Czechoslovak politicians in

London. This archive contains both debates over political recognition of the Czechoslovaks, and the discussions surrounding the creation of the RAF squadrons and reveals how these two movements were intertwined. I supplemented this work with time at the Karl Lisicky Collection at the University of College London's School of Slavic and Eastern European Studies' Library, to gain more of a Czech perspective as to why the Squadrons were initially established. Lisicky was the Counsellor of the Czechoslovak Embassy in London during this time and a longtime member of the Czechoslovak foreign service, and therefore has documents relating to both British-Czechoslovak relations and internal Czechoslovak developments.

II. Squadron Development and Motivations

After the occupation and splitting of Czechoslovakia at the behest of the Germans, most of the airmen who fled the country ended up in France, usually via Poland. This was either by using Poland as simply the pathway to France to join the Foreign Legion, or occasionally through arrival with the Polish forces after the invasion of Poland and the start of the war. In either case, France was a logical destination for both soldiers and politicians seeking to resist Nazi efforts outside of Czechoslovakia, because it was both an ideological ally in antifascist fighting and an ally politically of Czechoslovakia courtesy of The Franco-Czechoslovak Treaty of Mutual Assistance of 1925.[6] The French were initially not particularly receptive to the political or military efforts of the Czechoslovaks, but by December of 1939 they, along with Britain, recognized a Czechoslovak National Committee (or the Czechoslovak National Liberation Committee) as a body that could participate in treaties in its own right, but not as the government of Czechoslovakia. The Czechoslovak National Committee was comprised of various self-exiled politicians who congregated in France and headed by the former president of Czechoslovakia, Edvard Beneš, with the explicit goals of being recognized as a full government-in-exile and the re-formation of an

[6] Ibid., 15.

independent, unified Czechoslovakia. In early 1940, optimism ran high among the Czechoslovaks that a small independent air force and an army would be created in France, as an accompanying force to the National Committee—and to a certain extent it was. In agreement with the French and British governments, the Czechoslovak National Committee began sending out recruitment letters for the formation of an "Independent Czechoslovak Army in France," calling citizens from across the globe to enlist in France to show that "Czechoslovakia has not perished."[7] By May of 1940, an agreement was signed by the French Government and Czechoslovak National Committee that established an independent fighting force, but it was mostly regarded as "window dressing" by all parties and forces effectively remained part of the French Foreign Legion.[8] However, it is very possible that these Czechoslovak military forces simply never got the chance to grow into fully independent units because of the Nazi invasion of France nearly immediately after, in mid-May.

When it became clear that France was falling, the National Committee fled to Britain, who at that point was seen as the last standing Allied nation. Britain had previously taken little interest in having either Czechoslovak political or military forces on its own soil, instead opting to keep them as allies under France's direction, but was now forced to consider receiving both. Once in London, Beneš and the National Committee immediately put pressure on the British to evacuate Czechoslovak troops alongside the French and Polish ones, who had already been granted permission to constitute on British soil. Their success, particularly in evacuating much of the small but experienced force of airmen, can be seen as the first political and military maneuver that eventually led to the recognition of Beneš and the National Committee as a full government-in-exile.

[7] Recruitment Letter, The Czechoslovak National Committee (date unknown), Folder E3, Box 11, Czechoslovak resistance in exile (1939–1945) LIS/3/3/11.; Has not [yet] perished is a common patriotic phrase found across Central and Eastern Europe, and at the time was found in the Polish national anthem and some pan-Slavic songs.
[8] Brown, "The Czechoslovak Air Force in Britain, 1940–1945," 18.

The airmen were the first seed of Czechoslovak military forces constituted on British soil, and because of their experienced nature were quickly made into squadrons in the Royal Air Force under British command. The first formal squadron in the Royal Air Force, the 310 fighter squadron, was created on July 10th, 1940. Two more squadrons, the 311 bomber squadron and the 312 fighter squadrons, followed in the coming months, even prior to the signing of a military agreement in October between the British and what would be, by then, the Czechoslovak Provisional Government.[9] The motivations for creating these RAF squadrons were quite different for the Czechoslovaks and the British, but tellingly both were strong enough to have them fighting even before the existence of an official agreement or even a more thoroughly recognized government-in-exile to tie them to.

For the Czechoslovak political exiles, having a "legitimate" military power actively fighting in the war was an integral part of their strategy to legitimize their claim as representatives of Czechoslovakia, but also in the fight for a post-war independent Czechoslovakia. This theme of legitimacy dominates the life and creation of the air force squadrons and the entirety of Czechoslovak resistance efforts outside of the homeland. In in the University of College London's School of Slavoic and Eastern European Studies' Library, the Lisicky Archive has select copies of Beneš' speeches throughout the war, which consistently stress the military's very concrete role in the effort to recreate an independent and unified Czechoslovakia post-war, rather than it being a situation of pure political effort. In the speech "Vojáci československé Republiky!" (Soldiers of the Czechoslovak Republic), delivered while in London, Beneš states "In this war, a nation that will not fight will not be free. We must fight here, and we will fight at home in a given moment. Without an army here [Britain] and without resistance at home, the nation would remain in chains and you would not return."[10] As a relatively experienced fighting force already, the Czechoslovak airmen evacuated from France were seen by the politicians as critical to the Czechoslovak

[9] Ibid., 30.
[10] Dr. Edvard Beneš, Speech "Vojáci československé Republiky!" (1940), Folder D2, Box 11, Czechoslovak resistance in exile (1939–1945), LIS 3/3/2.

liberation effort within Britain in every sense—militarily, and politically as a unit tied to the National Committee. By the time of the formal military agreement concerning Czechoslovak forces, they were still the foremost fighting units of Czechoslovaks in Britain, evidenced by the fact that their section is notably twice as long and more fleshed out than the portion of the agreement pertaining to all other military forces.[11]

On the other end of this agreement, the British Government did not see the formation of Czechoslovak R.A.F. squadrons as a priority until hundreds of airmen were evacuated to their doorstep. Prior to the fall of France, the Air Ministry, which oversaw the R.A.F., had internally debated bringing a selection of Czechoslovak airmen over to Britain to incorporate into existing British squadrons. One of the most vocal proponents of the plan, Group-Captain Frank Beaumont, the former British Air Attache to Prague, argued that the airmen would be valuable as long-distance bombers and reconnaissance pilots over their homeland, and that given the fact that many had been trained both in their homeland and in France as pilots, it would be a shame to waste such quality personnel.[12] This was, however, not the majority view in either the Air Ministry or in foreign relations, due to doubts about the Czech's true capabilities and a preference to keep the shakily constituted National Committee at an arms distance, so these proposals never came to fruition. Upon the arrival of the evacuated airmen though, they were swiftly put to use and squadrons created due to a mix of factors. For one, the force was already somewhat experienced, and air power was as more important than ever before due to the early stages of the Battle of Britain. Perhaps most importantly, Britain saw itself as the final bastion of Allied forces in Western Europe and sought to maintain a sense of Allied unity and morale. Even Beaumont's earlier proposal opens by indicating that it should be considered because Polish forces were already being constituted in Britain under the R.A.F. with permission of the French, and he sees no reason

[11] Agreement Between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Provisional Czechoslovak Government Concerning the Czechoslovak Armed Forces (25 October 1940) [AIR 2/5162], Correspondence of the Air Ministry (AIR 2), Records of the Air Ministry, Royal Air Force and Air Historical Branch, at the British National Archives at Kew.
[12] Frank Beaumont, Statement by Group Captain Beaumont "Use of Czech Personnel in the R.A.F." (July 1940), AIR 2/5153.

to exclude the similarly allied Czechoslovaks from such an arrangement. For the British, creating the Czechoslovak squadrons was a case of circumstance and convenience, with hopes that they would strengthen an image of allied unity during a harsh loss.

III. Contributions to further recognition

According to Beneš' memoirs, the period surrounding the fall of France was the start of a second push for a government-in-exile, as the arrival of military forces gave these conversations a new and firmer legal and practical basis.[13] At this time, he was recognized only as the head of the Czechoslovak National Committee, which, while recognized as a "governing body," was not seen as a true government. Even prior to the recognition of the National Committee, Beneš and his allies pushed for recognition as a full government-in-exile, but Allied forces remained hesitant to do so.

Within the British Foreign Office, further recognition as even a Provisional government-in-exile, a status which would not acknowledge the body as the future leadership of a reconstituted nation or give it full diplomatic recognition, was controversial.[14] An internal memo on July 1st, 1940 outlines that some of the major hesitancies were a lack of unity among former Czechoslovak citizens abroad, especially former Slovak separatists, fears of alienating nearby countries such as Poland and Hungary that had previous claims to Czechoslovak territory, and an overall wariness to commit to reinstating pre-war borders in Central Europe.[15] Although not mentioned in that particular memo, within his memoirs Beneš acknowledges another major obstacle to the recognition of any sort of Czechoslovak government-in-exile in the form of legal continuity. He asserts that the Czechoslovak state never legally ceased to exist because all actions after the Munich

[13] Edvard Beneš, *Memoirs: From Munich to New War and New Victory.* Translated by Godfrey Lias. Allen & Unwin, 1954.
[14] Memorandum on the Status of the Provisional Czechoslovak Government (1940), File 1320/12, Status of Provisional Czechoslovak Government, Political Departments: Correspondence from 1906 to 1966 (FO 371), Foreign Office Archive at the British National Archives at Kew (FO), FO 371/26394.
[15] Memorandum on the Recognition of a Czecho-Slovak Provisional Government (1 July 1940), File C 7464/2/12, Recognition of Czecho-Slovak National Committee and other political matters, Czechoslovak Confidential, FO 371/24289. See also Michael Dockrill, "The Foreign Office, Dr Eduard Benes and the Czechoslovak Government-in-Exile 1939–41," *Diplomacy and Statecraft* 6, no. 3 (1995): 701–18.

agreement, such his resignation and the creation of Slovakia, were unconstitutional and performed under duress.[16] In a push by Beneš and the National Committee, a series of letters was written to Edward Wood—better known as Viscount Halifax—the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, from July 9th to July 18th, and by July 21st, 1940, the hesitancies were overcome, and the Czechoslovak Provisional Government was recognized by the British.[17]

A strong factor in pushing internal Foreign Office debates towards more recognition of a Provisional Government appears to be military-focused reasoning, especially as plans for Czechoslovak fighting forces coalesced. In particular, the British saw a functional unit of airmen as an early possibility, and a relationship between the political forces and military ones needed to be hammered out. In a summary of a phone call with Dr. Beneš from June 21st 1940, William Strang, the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, asserts that with the fall of France, there would be "in this country large numbers of Czech soldiers and airmen, together with an increased number of political refugees" and that Beneš would likely "be in a better position to negotiate with His Majesty's Government as to the future organization of the Czechoslovak armed forces in the country" if a Provisional Government could be constituted. This is because Beneš believed the National Committee lacked sufficient power.[18] This document reveals how the arrival of airmen and military forces more broadly was directly linked to the push to recognize a Provisional Government, both in the eyes of the Czech Politicians, and increasingly for the British Foreign Office. Furthermore, on the same day, an internal letter written by Frank Roberts, argues rather explicitly in favor of recognizing a provisional government due to the military capability and utility of the Czechoslovaks. He opens by noting that the Czechs have strong motivation to fight the

[16] Edvard Beneš, *Memoirs: From Munich to New War and New Victory*, trans. Godfrey Lias. (Allen & Unwin, 1954), 106.
[17] Smetana, *In the Shadow of Munich*, 194.
[18] William Strang, Summary of a phone call from Dr. Beneš, (21 June 1940), File C 7645, Recognition of Czecho-Slovak National Committee and other political matters, Czechoslovak Confidential, FO 371/24289.

Germans, and that "any encouragement we can give to the Czechs might, therefore, prove of first-class utility to ourselves." He further asks:

> Since the war, the Czech exiles have been fighting beside the Allies and have organized, I believe, a far from contemptible air contingent… On these grounds, but particularly on that of our own needs, is there not now a strong case for recognising the Czechs as our Allies and for recognising Dr. Benes as head of a Czechoslovak Government?[19]

It appears that within the Foreign Office, there was rising support for a Provisional Government, not only because of the imminent arrival of Czechoslovak political and military forces, but also because of the utility of the forces, particularly the airmen, in the Allied war effort. Even the aforementioned July 1st memo, which expressed hesitancies over creating a Provisional Government, acknowledges that due to logistical challenges of relocating the headquarters of the Czechoslovak National Committee, several thousand troops, and hundreds of pilots, "there should therefore be an advantage in having in this country a Czecho-Slovak Provisional Government with the necessary authority to control the Czecho-Slovak soldiers and airmen and other civilian refugees." It even suggested that if "Dr. Benes were assured of further recognition, he would no longer have much difficulty in securing the necessary unity among the Czech and Slovak emigres."[20] Although the Provisional Government never had full authority to control Czechoslovak military forces, as they were enlisted in and commanded by the British Army and Royal Air Force Volunteer Reserves, the prospect of it appears to have been under real consideration, and in reality the Provisional Government ended up with on-paper and symbolic control of these forces.

This military justification for recognizing a Provisional Government and a desire for formal allies in the war effort is even seen in the public announcement of the Provisional Government. The Provisional Government status was confirmed privately in a letter between Lord Halifax and Beneš on July 21st, with the conditions that the British would not commit themselves to any particular Czechoslovak borders upon the end of the war, and that Provisional Government was to be the representative of the Czech and Slovak people,

[19] Frank Kenyon Roberts, Letter (21 June 1940), FO 371/24289.
[20] Memorandum on the Recognition of a Czecho-Slovak Provisional Government.

rather than a full representative of pre-war Czechoslovakia. Precise jurisdiction over Czechoslovak armed forces was left to be ironed out with a later agreement. This was followed by the public announcement on July 23rd, and a statement by Winston Churchill in the House of Commons that this Czechoslovak Provisional Government would be in practice treated the same as fully recognized governments-in-exile that represented pre-war nations.[21] The following day, on July 24th, Richard "Rab" Butler, the Foreign Office Spokesperson to the House of Commons and an MP, broadcasted the news to the wider public, presumably on the BBC. In this announcement, the military justification, specifically highlighting airmen, is particularly present, and extends even to why the Czechoslovaks are considered allies and why the Czechoslovak national Committee was recognized in the first place. After announcing the news of Provisional Government status, he states that:

> Since the outbreak of war much work has been done abroad by the Czechoslovak leaders to prepare for the restoration of liberty to their people. The first stage was the formation in France of the Czechoslovak Legion and of Czechoslovak sections of the French Air Force. The British and French Governments recognised the Czechoslovak National Committee last year in order to help those who were organizing these armed forces. These soldiers and pilots showed the greatest courage during the recent fighting in France and... now we have these trained and tried soldiers and pilots in this country and we are proud to have them at our side in this struggle. Czechoslovak pilots have already carried the war in the air back into Germany. We trust that before too long they will pay, not flying visits to Germany, but will take up a permanent residence again in their own freed country.[22]

By this time in late July, he correctly stated that the earliest Czechoslovak military forces which had regrouped on British soil had already joined the war effort – the airmen, both as independent fighters and in the formation of the first R.A.F. squadrons. Although this speech was presumably aimed at the broader British public, and hence stressed a unified and strong war effort above all else, it is telling that the Provisional Government was justified in its creation and lauded as an ally due to early military efforts, mainly in the form of the Czechoslovak airmen and squadrons.

[21] Smetana, *In the Shadow of Munich*, 194–5.
[22] Copy of Broadcast by Mr. Butler (24 July 1940), Recognition of Czecho-Slovak National Committee and other political matters, Czechoslovak Confidential, FO 371/24289.

IV. Pushes for Independence

Soon after its recognition, the Czechoslovak Provisional Government entered into negotiations with the British Foreign Office over the formal creation of ground and air forces on British Soil. In these early efforts, we can see symbolic and contractual pushes for independence and a desire to have a truly independent air force directly under their control.

The final version of the Anglo-Czechoslovak Military Agreement of October 25th, 1940, shines a light on how this desire for independence appears in the creation of the R.A.F. squadrons. The agreement permitted the flying of Czechoslovak flag alongside the British one where airmen are based/trained, requiring that all members of the Czechoslovak squadrons take an oath to both the British Crown and the Czechoslovak Provisional Government, and promised to keep Czechoslovak personnel involved in all hirings and promotions of their airmen and crews and to retain Czechoslovak officers alongside British ones. It also declared the existence of a Czechoslovak Air Force, nominally under the Provisional Government's rule, although the British maintain commanding control, as all squadron personnel are members of the R.A.F. Volunteer Reserves.[23] Furthermore, symbolic independence remains an important theme as highlighted in Minute Sheet – Air Ministry File No. A.139077/40, which concerns the "wearing of metal flying badge by Czechoslovak personnel in R.A.F.V.R.," in which British officers of the R.A.F. Volunteer Reserves, which commanded the Czech Squadrons, took issue with the unauthorized wearing of the metal flying badge of the Czech Air Force that many airmen had been wearing. An Air Ministry Official responds that as per agreement between the British and Czechoslovak governments that the Czechoslovak Squadrons are recognized as part of the armed forces of the Czechoslovak government, and therefore part of the Czechoslovak Air Force, and should be allowed to wear the badge in addition to the R.A.F. uniform. He stated that:

> This arrangement [operation by the R.A.F.V.R.] necessitated a certain sacrifice of pride in national independence on the part of the Czechoslovak authorities,

[23] Agreement between His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom and the Provisional Czechoslovak Government concerning the employment of the Czechoslovak Forces (or The Anglo-Czechoslovak Military Agreement) (25 October 1940), File 5162, AIR/2.

> who, whilst maintaining an independent national army, agreed to such an arrangement for their air force in the common allied interest, and it will be appreciated that I am most anxious to avoid the occurrence of any difficulty..." and, "This badge is one on which they set great store, so great indeed that any intimation that they should remove it would certainly lead to the greatest discontent, at the very least, with consequent adverse effect on morale and efficiency in their war effort. It is perhaps difficult for us, still with our own country in our possession, to realize what value they set on wearing an emblem which signifies to them a national tradition whilst exiled from their country now in enemy hands. You will remember that it was only after the greatest pressure that the Czechoslovak authorities withdrew their insistent demands for a special national cap badge.[24]

Although this letter and orders were controversial even within the Air Ministry, its decision stood. The letter encapsulates the martial politics at play, a struggle for independence on the Czechoslovak's part, and a sympathetic but firm desire for Allied and R.A.F. unity within the British military. In a later minute sheet, officials expressed frustration with the Czechoslovak government-in-exile's repeated requests to form an independent Air Force out of the Czechoslovak Squadrons of the R.A.F.V.R., as the Polish had done. The Air Ministry opted to turn it down because of their small numbers, and in its internal and informal "Memorandum on the Proposed Revision of the Czechoslovak Forces Agreement" it referenced that the Czechoslovak squadrons were a shrinking force, and asserted in a frustrated tone that "we have always recognised the Czechoslovak Air Force as a political necessity; at the same time we cannot but regard it as a military luxury."[25]

V. Conclusion

The Czechoslovak R.A.F. squadrons were truly a political necessity in more ways than one. Because of the airmen's early fighting capabilities and relative experience, they were a powerful justification for the recognition of a Czechoslovak Provisional Government on British soil, and the squadrons and their symbolic independence were regarded as a powerful political tool for legitimizing a future independent Czechoslovakia. With three

[24] Minute Sheet on Wearing of metal flying badge by Czechoslovak personnel in R.A.F.V.R., File No. A.139077/40, AIR 2/10174.
[25] Minute Sheet and Memorandum on the Proposed Revision of the Czechoslovak Forces Agreement (date unknown), AIR 2/5162.

R.A.F. squadrons and an army battalion in place, alongside the building up of governmental structures, a full Czechoslovak Government-in-exile was recognized by the British on July 18th, 1941, something that would have been nearly unthinkable just two years prior.

Bibliography

AIR 2: Correspondence of the Air Ministry, Air Ministry Archive., British National Archives at Kew.

Beneš, Edvard. *Memoirs: From Munich to New War and New Victory.* Translated by Godfrey Lias. Allen & Unwin, 1954.

Brown, Alan. *Airmen in Exile: The Allied Air Forces in the Second World War*. Sutton, 2000.

Brown, Alan. "The Czechoslovak Air Force in Britain, 1940–1945 (BL)." PhD diss., University of Southampton, 1998. https://www-proquest-com.dartmouth.idm.oclc.org/dissertations-theses/czechoslovak-air-force-britain-1940-1945-bl/docview/898767016/se-2.

Dockrill, Michael. "The Foreign Office, Dr Eduard Benes and the Czechoslovak Government-in-Exile 1939–41." *Diplomacy and Statecraft* 6, no. 3 (1995): 701–18.

FO 371/24289: Recognition of Czecho-Slovak National Committee and other political matters, Czechoslovak Confidential, Foreign Office Archive, British National Archives at Kew.

FO 371/26394: Status of Provisional Czechoslovak Government, Political Departments: Correspondence from 1906 to 1966, Foreign Office Archive, British National Archives at Kew.

FO 470: Czechoslovakia: annual reports, 1936–1968, Foreign Office Archive, British National Archives at Kew.

Hauner, Milan. "Beginnings of the Czechoslovak Government in Exile 1939–1941." In *Exile in and From Czechoslovakia During the 1930s and 1940s*, edited by Charmain Brinson and Marian Malet. The Yearbook of the Research Centre for German and Austrian Exile Studies. Brill, 2009.

LIS 3/3: Czechoslovak resistance in exile (1939–1945), in the Karl Lisicky Collection (1915–1948) at the School of Slavonic and East European Studies (SSEES) Library, University of London.

Smetana, Vít. *In the Shadow of Munich: British Policy towards Czechoslovakia from the Endorsement to the Renunciation of the Munich Agreement (1938–1942)*. Karolinum Press, 2014.

No Time Like the Present: Gift Exchange and the Pre-Accession Experience of Elizabeth I

Olivia Cannings
University of Edinburgh

Elizabeth I when a Princess c.1546, attributed to William Scrots; © Royal Collection Enterprises Limited 2025 | Royal Collection Trust.

This essay will seek to explore the significance of gifting to the pre-accession experience of Elizabeth I, and to analyse what her gifting practices reveal about her status and position in the late Henrician court, as well as about Elizabeth as a person. This will be done primarily through examining three translations that were produced and gifted by Elizabeth. The first translation is of Marguerite of Navarre's 1531 *Le Miroir de L'Ame Pécheresse* (*The Glass of the Sinful Soul*, hereon referred to as *The Glass*), a text heavily influenced by the principles of Erasmianism, translated from French to English in 1544 as a 1545 New Year's Day gift for her stepmother, Catherine Parr.[1] The final two translations were written in 1545 to be presented as 1546 New Year's Day gifts: Catherine Parr's 1545 *Prayers or Meditations*, another Reformist text, translated from English into Latin, French and Italian for her father, Henry VIII; and the first chapter of John Calvin's *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (hereon referred to as *Institutes*), translated from the 1541 French version for Catherine.[2] Historiography has tended to dismiss Elizabeth's translations as only being evidence of her precocity and intellect, generally focusing on their role as a gift to find parallels with gifting in Elizabeth's reign.[3] This approach ignores the question of why Elizabeth chose to produce and gift these translations, and what they reveal about her position at court in the mid-1540s. This essay hopes to apply frameworks of Early Modern gifting practices and women's participation in the textual economy of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to argue that Elizabeth's translations, in fact, reflect her keen awareness of her situation from a young age. These final years of Henry VIII's reign are particularly interesting with respect to Elizabeth's life, since she was beginning to be reintroduced into her father's household after his marriage to Catherine Parr in 1543, and had been restored to the succession that same year.[4]

[1] Elizabeth I, *Elizabeth I: Translations, 1544–1589*, ed. Janel Mueller and Joshua Scodel (University of Chicago Press, 2009), 25–7.
[2] Ibid., 129–30, 203.
[3] See Felicity Heal, *The Power of Gifts: Gift-Exchange in Early Modern England* (Oxford University Press, 2014), 21; Marc Shell, *Elizabeth's Glass* (University of Nebraska Press, 1993), 7; Judith M. Richards, *Elizabeth I* (Routledge, 2012), 18.
[4] Ibid., 19–21.

With this in mind, an analysis of the dedicatory prefaces to Elizabeth's translations will argue that Elizabeth's position in this period was unstable, and that she used these gift translations to curry favour with her father and to maintain her position. Then, using Lisa Klein's theory of the "handwrought" gift, and examining frameworks of female gifting in the Early Modern period, it will be argued that Elizabeth was aware of and exploited existing social structures in order to produce translations and increase the efficacy of her gifts. Finally, a comparison with the translating practices of her half-sister, Mary, whose translations did not enter the gift-exchange system, will show Elizabeth's unique situation and the special importance of gifting to her.

An examination of Elizabeth's gift translations uncovers the instability of Elizabeth's position at the court of Henry VIII in the mid-1540s, highlighted particularly by her dedicatory prefaces, which employ a humble and supplicatory tone to increase her favour with her father and stepmother. It is first useful to establish why Elizabeth's dedications can provide so much insight into the purpose and context of her gift translations, by applying Gérard Genette's paratext theory. In his book, Genette argues for the importance of paratexts, broadly defined as anything that does not form part of the text, to the function of books, contending that it is elements of paratext, such as the title, epigraph, and, crucially, dedications, which allow a book to be defined as a book.[5] Moreover, he argues that paratexts fundamentally influence how the reader is meant to understand a text, and that a dedication "proclaims a relationship" between the writer and the dedicatee to give a text a certain social standing.[6] Though Genette's argument focuses on nineteenth and twentieth century Western literature, he draws extensively on the classical origins of paratexts, and his framework has been applied to works of the sixteenth century, making it relevant to Elizabeth's translations.[7] Applying this framework to the dedicatory prefaces in Elizabeth's

[5] Gérard Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, trans. Jane E. Lewin (Cambridge University Press, 1997).
[6] Ibid., 135.
[7] See Mary S. Lewis, "Introduction: The Dedication as Paratext," in *Cui Dono Lepidum Novum Libellum?: Dedicating Latin Works and Motets in the Sixteenth Century,* ed. Ignace Bossuyt et al. (Leuven University Press, 2008).

gift translations suggests that she intended her dedications to alter the interpretation of her translations and highlight the special nature of the translations as gifts.

The dedicatory prefaces to *The Glass*, *Prayers or Meditations*, and the *Institutes* show that Elizabeth designed these gifts in response to the instability of her situation, in order to ingratiate herself with her father and stepmother and thereby secure and maintain her position. The shared goal of each translation is underlined by their similarity, with all three praising the addressee, asking them, with some false modesty, to excuse the poor quality of the translation, and to cherish the translation not for its linguistic merit, but as a personal gift, all underpinned by her humble tone. In all three translations she refers to herself as a "humble daughter," opting for the superlative "most humble" in her 1545 translations, establishing her tone from the outset and her position as an inferior to Henry and Catherine, thus inviting the reader to interpret the translations as acts of deference and respect.[8] Admittedly, this deference could be interpreted as Elizabeth paying due respect to her monarchs and parents, rather than as evidence of Elizabeth's precarious situation. However, the opening inscription of her half-sister Mary's 1527 translation *Concede mihi, misericors Deus*, undertaken at a similar age, which begins with the phrase "I haue sed," asserting Mary as the most important figure in her translation, suggests that this kind of dedication was unconventional for the daughter of a king, albeit an illegitimate one.[9] Moreover, Elizabeth's use of excessive flattery, praising Catherine's "excellent witte, and godly lerninge" in the preface to *The Glass*, addressing her as "the most high, most illustrious and magnanimous" in the preface to the *Institutes*, and saying that Henry "is of such excellence that none or few are to be compared with you in royal and ample marks of honor [sic]" underlines her intention to ingratiate herself with her father and stepmother by means of her gifts, attempting to capture their good will before they embark upon reading the

[8] Elizabeth I, *Translations*, 40, 135, 213.
[9] Rosalind Smith, "Paratextual Economies in Tudor Women's Translations: Margaret More Roper, Mary Roper Basset and Mary Tudor," in *Trust and Proof: Translators in Renaissance Print Culture*, ed. Andrea Rizzi (Brill, 2018), 204.

translation, as well as striking a conciliatory tone.[10] Indeed, this theme of conciliation can be applied to her choice of translations. Roger Ellis, focusing on the *Institutes* in his examination of the influence of Henry VIII's regime on Elizabeth's translations, notes the significance of Elizabeth's choice to translate the first chapter of the *Institutes*, which was intended to be universally applicable to all Christians, arguing for the presence of God in each individual.[11] Ellis' approach, though it focuses on how Elizabeth's translations reflect the atmosphere of the late Henrician court, not Elizabeth's own experience, is useful. It suggests that, by translating a text that emphasised unity, Elizabeth recognised how the instability of the Tudor court, which had become more orthodox in its religious stance after the 1539 Act of Six Articles and the 1543 King's Book, shaped her own unstable position.[12]

Another important consideration of the purpose of Elizabeth's gift translations is how she intended her gifts to be received, and whether they were intended to be private to Henry and Catherine, or to be circulated throughout the court as a public show of loyalty. Elizabeth's request to Catherine in her preface to *The Glass* that "no other, (but your highnes onely) shal rede it, or se it, lesse my fauttes be knowen of many" casts doubt on whether she wished for her translation to be circulated.[13] Valerie Schutte, in her comparison of the pre-accession translations of Mary and Elizabeth Tudor, takes this claim at face value, arguing that, although Elizabeth's dedication follows a "typical rhetorical pattern," her request that it be kept private to Catherine deviates from standard practice, since the purpose of dedications was generally so that a patron would distribute a book and enable it to be published, something that Elizabeth likely did not desire.[14] However, although Schutte's assessment that Elizabeth presumably did not intend for her translation to be published is fair, it seems unlikely that Elizabeth would have intended for this gift to be read only by Catherine, since she produced it to increase her social standing. Indeed, it is

[10] Elizabeth I, *Translations*, 42, 136, 213.
[11] Roger Ellis, "The Juvenile Translations of Elizabeth Tudor," *Translation and Literature* 18, no. 2 (2009): 167.
[12] Ibid., 160–1.
[13] Elizabeth I, *Translations*, 42.
[14] Valerie Schutte, *Princesses Mary and Elizabeth Tudor and the Gift Book Exchange* (ARC Humanities Press, 2021), 37.

probable that Elizabeth's request was simply an extreme expression of humility, since she had already created a tone of self-abasement, professing her work "in many places to be rude, and nothinge done as it shuld be."[15] Furthermore, Elizabeth clearly exploits literary conventions for dedications, for example referring to her translation as a "lytell boke," a stock phrase for expressing humility in ancient Roman poetic dedications, as Harm-Jan van Dam notes in his discussion of dedications in classical antiquity.[16] Although van Dam also notes that extreme humility in classical dedications was not meant to be taken literally, it should be acknowledged that, in Elizabeth's case, the humility she expresses, though perhaps exaggerated for literary purposes, is genuine.[17] Schutte's assessment also ignores the public gifting practices of the Tudor court, where Henry displayed gifts on specially constructed buffets in order to show off his gifts and to express favour towards certain courtiers.[18] Elizabeth was undoubtedly aware of the publicity of gift exchange at the Tudor court, and likely viewed her gift as a public show of loyalty as much as a private one. This also links to Genette's emphasis on the importance of the relationship proclaimed in a dedication, with the dedications ultimately acting as public mediums for Elizabeth to express to her readers, perhaps courtiers, her loyalty to her father. To conclude, the purpose of Elizabeth's gift translations to gain favour with her father and stepmother and to maintain her position speaks to Elizabeth's unstable position at the Tudor court. Her dedications underline how precarious her situation was by means of their humble tone as well as her eagerness to publicly proclaim her loyalty to Henry and Catherine through the medium of a gift at court.

Having established the instability of Elizabeth's situation in the late Henrician court and the purpose of her gift translations in maintaining her position, it will now be argued that Elizabeth's gift translations provide evidence of her keen understanding of her situation and her adeptness at manipulating social dynamics to improve her position. Elizabeth's

[15] Elizabeth I, *Translations*, 42.
[16] Harm-Jan van Dam, "'*Vobis Pagina Nostra Dedicatur*': Dedication in Classical Antiquity," in *Cui Dono Lepidum Novum Libellum?: Dedicating Latin Works and Motets in the Sixteenth Century,* ed. Ignace Bossuyt et al. (Leuven University Press, 2008), 26.
[17] Ibid.
[18] Heal, *The Power of Gifts*, 96.

choice to influence her father and stepmother by means of a written gift illustrates her awareness of social norms for elite Tudor women, since she acted within permitted spheres of influence. Through an examination of poems written and dedicated to various figures by three women in the Elizabethan period, Jane Donawerth argues that women legitimised and facilitated the circulation of their poetry by presenting it as part of the Tudor gift-exchange system.[19] She argues that, by allowing their poetry to function within this system, they exerted agency and influence upon political structures.[20] Though Donawerth's argument applies to original works, rather than translations, it nevertheless extends to Elizabeth's translations, since she drew upon the frameworks of gifting that were available to her to influence her position. Indeed, she acted within the tradition of Early Modern elite women as translators and authors, such as Marguerite of Navarre, the original author of *The Glass*, Catherine Parr, and even her sister, Mary. By aligning herself with these women and following a well-established precedent, Elizabeth was able not only to make a public display of loyalty towards Henry and Catherine, but also to assert her own voice and agency to her father and the Tudor court, while acting within the acceptable social parameters for a woman.

Moreover, Elizabeth's use of "handwrought" gifts further demonstrates her adeptness and awareness of the social outlets available to her and of the value of an appropriate gift, as underlined by Lisa Klein's framework.[21] Klein argues for the efficacy of personal, and particularly "handwrought" gifts through an examination of gifts given and received by Elizabeth throughout her reign.[22] Drawing on Marcel Mauss' observation about gifts being imbued with the spirit of the donor, she argues that a personal gift (one tailored to the giver) forged a special connection between the donor and the recipient, with a particularly special

[19] Jane Donawerth, "Women's Poetry and the Tudor-Stuart System of Gift Exchange," in *Women, Writing, and the Reproduction of Culture in Tudor and Stuart Britain*, ed. Mary E. Burke et al. (Syracuse University Press, 2000), 10–8.
[20] Ibid., 18.
[21] Lisa M. Klein, "Your Humble Handmaid: Elizabethan Gifts of Needlework," *Renaissance Quarterly* 50, no.2 (1997).
[22] Ibid.

bond being formed between women by "handwrought" gifts.[23] She applies this framework to Elizabeth's gift translations, focusing particularly on the embroidered covers, arguing that, through her gifts to Catherine, Elizabeth positioned herself within the "female community" at the Tudor court and also sought to achieve her own goals.[24] Indeed, Elizabeth herself acknowledges the importance of the "handwrought" nature of her translations in her preface to *Prayers or Meditations*, saying "if it is mediocre, even if it is worthy of no praise at all, nevertheless if it is well received, it will incite me eagerly."[25] Here, Elizabeth recognises that the value of her gift fundamentally lies within the care and effort that she has expended upon it, rather than the skill it displays, and acknowledges that this is what gives the gift its special quality.

Klein's focus on the gift containing not only textual elements, but also visual elements is notable, and links to the idea of paratext influencing the meaning of a gift. As Mary Lewis notes in her introduction to the application of Genette's theory to dedications, paratext can fall into four categories: "authorial, organizational, visual, and editorial."[26] The covers of the translations fall into the categories of "visual paratext," creating a first impression about its purpose and content, since it is the first thing the reader sees. For example, Elizabeth embroidered the cover of *The Glass* with Catherine Parr's initials (KP), signalling her relationship with Catherine and amplifying the special connection that the gift creates.[27] Moreover, Schutte notes how the translations of 1545 were visibly coordinated, with *Prayers or Meditations* featuring a red cover with a "blue and silver monogram," and the *Institutes* featuring a blue cover with a "red and silver monogram," so that, when placed together, they would declare to the court Elizabeth's loyalty and connection to Henry and Catherine.[28] This fits with Klein's thesis and illustrates Elizabeth's recognition of the importance of the visual quality of her gifts, ensuring that they created a positive first

[23] Ibid., 471–6.
[24] Ibid., 477–83.
[25] Elizabeth I, *Translations*, 136.
[26] Lewis, "Introduction," 3.
[27] Susan Frye, *Pens and Needles: Women's Textualities in Early Modern England* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010), 33.
[28] Schutte, *Princesses*, 56.

impression on their reader and that the outside mirrored the care and effort put into the inside.

The content of Elizabeth's gift translations also provides evidence of her ability to appeal to her recipients by personalising her gifts and adapting them to create maximum effect. The genre of the translations appeal to Henry and Catherine individually, with *Prayers or Meditations* indirectly praising Henry by praising the work of his wife, and with *The Glass* and the *Institutes* appealing to Catherine's reformist tendencies.[29] This personalisation even extends to a linguistic level. Nadia Fusini argues that moments regarded as errors in Elizabeth's translation of *The Glass* are manifestations of her subconscious feelings surrounding her family's relationship with incest.[30] She draws particularly on a line where Elizabeth translates the word *père* (father) as mother in her translation "Mother and daughter: O happy kindred," interpreting this modification as owing to the fact that Elizabeth was unable to conceive of a positive paternal bond.[31] This is unconvincing, since Elizabeth was beginning to enjoy more favour with her father, and *The Glass* was a deliberate attempt to increase and maintain this favour through her stepmother.[32] It is more likely that this was Elizabeth tailoring her gift to Catherine, to assert their relationship and their maternal bond. Indeed, it is possible that Elizabeth was mimicking Catherine's literary style, which manipulated grammatical gender to convey her message, for example de-gendering the speaker in her 1545 *Prayers or Meditations* to create a more universal message.[33] Moreover, this same approach can be detected in Elizabeth's translation of *Prayers or Meditations*, where, bound by linguistic gender in French, Italian and Latin, she reinserted gender into her translation, favouring the masculine, thus making

[29] John N. King, "Patronage and Piety: The Influence of Catherine Parr," in *Silent But for the Word: Tudor Women as Patrons, Translators, and Writers of Religious Works,* ed. Margaret P. Hannay (Kent State University Press, 1985), 51.
[30] Nadia Fusini, "What Elizabeth Knew. Language as Mirror and Gift," in *Elizabeth I in Writing: Language, Power, and Representation in Early Modern England*, Queenship and Power, ed. Donatella Montini and Iolanda Plescia (Springer International Publishing, 2018), 205.
[31] Fusini, "What Elizabeth Knew," 207; Shell, *Elizabeth's Glass*, 109.
[32] Richards, *Elizabeth I*, 19.
[33] Janel Mueller and Joshua Scodel, introduction to "Prayers or Meditations," in *Elizabeth I: Translations, 1544–1589*, ed. Janel Mueller and Joshua Scodel (University of Chicago Press, 2009), 130.

the text more appropriate for her father.[34] This disproves Fusini's theory and underlines Elizabeth's awareness of the importance of the personalised gift, and her attention to detail in crafting it. In summary, Elizabeth's gift translations underline her adeptness and awareness of the social role in which she was placed as an elite woman, using conventions surrounding gift exchange and writing to her advantage, and of the importance of personalised gifts in forging personal connections.

Finally, examining the use of translations by the future Mary I will underline Elizabeth's unique situation and how gifting dynamics fundamentally differed for the two, with Elizabeth needing to assert her position through handmade gifts in a way that Mary did not, though both occupied the same legal position as acknowledged illegitimate daughters of the king.[35] Schutte argues that Mary included a short inscription instead of a dedicatory preface in her 1527 translation of Thomas Aquinas' prayer *Concede mihi, misericors Deus*, owing to the fact that, as a princess at that time, she did not need to legitimise her position.[36] Though Mary was still legally a legitimate princess in this period, this translation provides a useful point of comparison with Elizabeth's, as they were both of similar ages, around eleven, but were in drastically different positions and acted accordingly. To complement Schutte's argument, it is useful to return to Genette, who notes that the omission of a dedication in a book is equally as conspicuous as featuring one, and means that the author either does not see anyone as worthy of a dedication in their book or does not see their book as worthy to be dedicated to anyone.[37] In this case, it seems likely that Mary did not see anybody as worthy of her text, nor did she need to dedicate it to add legitimacy, since her status as a princess was sufficient. Moreover, owing to her status, Mary did not need to offer her translation as part of the gift-exchange system for it to be circulated, unlike Elizabeth, who had to rely on the status of her father and stepmother for her translations to be circulated. The fact that Mary wrote her translation in a book of hours that featured

[34] Ibid., 131.
[35] Richards, *Elizabeth I*, 20–1.
[36] Schutte, *Princesses*, 25.
[37] Genette, *Paratexts*, 135.

annotations by Henry VII and Elizabeth of York also emphasised her royal status and authority.[38]

Furthermore, Mary enjoyed more stability than Elizabeth in her position in the 1540s, despite their similar legal statuses. Schutte argues that Mary's name carried more authority than Elizabeth's in this period, on the basis of her involvement in Catherine Parr's project to translate Erasmus' *Paraphrases* (published in 1548), and a letter from Catherine to Mary asking Mary to allow her name to be attributed to her translation.[39] This is another example of Mary being able to circulate her translations based on her own status, not having to participate in the gift-exchange system in order to legitimise her involvement in the activity. Indeed, even when Mary did give gifts, Schutte notes that these were generally bought, not handmade, underlining how Mary did not have to affirm her position through thoughtful, carefully wrought gifts as Elizabeth did, attesting to Elizabeth's unique situation.[40] Overall, Mary's ability to produce translations in her youth and as an adult legitimised by her own status, rather than relying on the authority of another, acts in sharp contrast to Elizabeth's situation. It highlights how unique Elizabeth's situation was, and thus how personalised gifting fulfilled a special role for her, allowing her to exert influence and forge relationships that would have been easily available to her had she still been a legitimate princess, or even of higher status.

In conclusion, an examination of the three gift translations undertaken by Elizabeth in 1544 and 1545 has shown that gifting was a significant part of Elizabeth I's pre-accession experience, and illuminates Elizabeth's unstable and unique situation in the late Henrician court, as well as her capability and ability to recognise the meaning and importance of gifts at a reasonably young age. Examining the dedicatory prefaces to Elizabeth's gift translations underlines the instability of her situation in her father's court, with the humble and deferential tone of each suggesting that Elizabeth's primary purpose in producing these gifts

[38] Smith, "Paratextual Economies," 206–27.
[39] Schutte, *Princesses*, 29–34.
[40] Ibid., 59–60.

was to improve, or maintain, her favour at court. Indeed, the very fact that Elizabeth included dedicatory prefaces in her translations demonstrated her need to add legitimacy to her work, which was not automatically bestowed by her diminished status, and also to make clear to Henry and Catherine, as well as others at the Tudor court, before they began reading that the translations were acts of devotion and loyalty. Moreover, Elizabeth's participation within the gift-exchange system and her use of "handwrought" translations provides evidence of her acute awareness of the frameworks she belonged to in Tudor society, what social expectations of her were, and of her ability to make use of these structures to secure her position and strengthen familial ties. Elizabeth's ability to make use of existing precedents in order to further her own goals is evident in her recognition of the special quality inherent in a handmade gift, which she alludes to herself in her preface to *Prayers or Meditations*, with her intertwining of the visual and textual mediums in her gift translations.[41] Finally, comparison with Mary's translations and attitudes to gifting underlines the unique nature of Elizabeth's position in the Tudor court and the significance of her participation in the gift-exchange system. While Mary was able to rely on her own status to circulate her translations, Elizabeth had to offer her translations as part of the gift-exchange system. Thus, Elizabeth occupied a unique space within the system of gift-exchange in the late Henrician period, relying on existing frameworks surrounding female gifting and writing to exert influence and maintain her position.

[41] Elizabeth I, *Translations*, 136.

Bibliography

van Dam, Harm-Jan. "'*Vobis Pagina Nostra Dedicatur*': Dedication in Classical Antiquity." In *Cui Dono Lepidum Novum Libellum?: Dedicating Latin Works and Motets in the Sixteenth Century,* edited by Ignace Bossuyt, Nele Gabriëls, Dirk Sacré, and Demmy Verbeke, 13–34. Leuven University Press, 2008.

Donawerth, Jane. "Women's Poetry and the Tudor-Stuart System of Gift Exchange." In *Women, Writing, and the Reproduction of Culture in Tudor and Stuart Britain*, edited by Mary E Burke, Jane Donawerth, Linda L. Dove and Karen Nelson, 3–18. Syracuse University Press, 2000.

Elizabeth I. *Elizabeth I: Translations, 1544–1589.* Edited by Janel Mueller and Joshua Scodel. University of Chicago Press, 2009.

Ellis, Roger. "The Juvenile Translations of Elizabeth Tudor." *Translation and Literature* 18, no. 2 (2009): 157–80.

Frye, Susan. *Pens and Needles: Women's Textualities in Early Modern England.* University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010.

Fusini, Nadia. "What Elizabeth Knew. Language as Mirror and Gift." In *Elizabeth I in Writing: Language, Power and Representation in Early Modern England.* Queenship and Power. Edited by Donatella Montini and Iolanda Plescia. Springer International Publishing, 2018. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-71952-8_10.

Genette, Gérard. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation.* Translated by Jane E. Lewin. Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Heal, Felicity. *The Power of Gifts: Gift-Exchange in Early Modern England.* Oxford University Press, 2014.

King, John, N. “Patronage and Piety: The Influence of Catherine Parr.” In *Silent But for the Word: Tudor Women as Patrons, Translators, and Writers of Religious Works*, edited by Margaret P. Hannay, 43–60. Kent State University Press, 1985.

Klein, Lisa M. “Your Humble Handmaid: Elizabethan Gifts of Needlework.” *Renaissance Quarterly* 50, no. 2 (1997): 459–93.

Lewis, Mary, S. “Introduction: The Dedication as Paratext.” In *Cui Dono Lepidum Novum Libellum?: Dedicating Latin Works and Motets in the Sixteenth Century,* edited by Ignace Bossuyt, Nele Gabriëls, Dirk Sacré, and Demmy Vferbeke. Leuven University Press, 2008.

Mueller, Janel and Joshua Scodel. Introduction to *Prayers or Meditations.* In Elizabeth I, *Elizabeth I: Translations, 1544–1589.* Edited by Janel Mueller and Joshua Scodel. University of Chicago Press, 2009.

Richards, Judith M. *Elizabeth I*. Routledge, 2012.

Schutte, Valerie. *Princesses Mary and Elizabeth Tudor and the Gift Book Exchange*. ARC Humanities Press, 2021.

Shell, Marc. *Elizabeth’s Glass.* University of Nebraska Press, 1993.