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In the 1943 English film *Courageous Mr. Penn*, William Penn falls madly in love with the beautiful Quakeress Gulielma Springett, marries her, is nearly devastated by her early death, and dies while reading her love letters. As her final letter floats from his limp hand to the ground, a middle-aged servant named Hannah looks sadly on. *The New York Times* panned the film for lacking "vitality" and for playing fast and loose with history. The reviewer wrote that, although Clifford Evans was fairly lifeless as William Penn, Deborah Kerr was "fetching in a spotless white bonnet as the first—and only—Mrs. Penn as far as this film goes." ¹ In fact William Penn was married twice, and his second wife, Hannah Callowhill, was at his side when he died.²

William Penn was married first to Gulielma Springett, from 1672 to her death in 1694, and, second, to Hannah Callowhill from 1696 until his own death in 1718. In marrying twice, William Penn was like many men in the Anglo-American world of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Mortality was high overall, but women's mortality in both England and America was generally higher than men's, particularly during the childbearing years.³ In William Penn's case there is a striking symmetry between his two marriages: each lasted about twenty-two years, and each resulted in eight pregnancies and seven or eight live childbirths.⁴ Both women were wealthy heiresses who each reportedly brought dowries of £10,000 into the marriage.⁵ But despite the apparent similarity of the two marriages, the images of William Penn's wives diverge sharply in the historical literature. With remarkably little variation since the 1700s, Quaker historians, Pennsylvania historians, and biographers of William Penn have drawn sharp contrasts between the characters of Gulielma and Hannah Penn and the relationship they had with their husband.⁶

Biographers have portrayed Gulielma Springett as the love of Penn's youth. She was 28 and he, 27, when they married, actually a bit older than the average age
of marriage in England. In Quaker literature, Gulielma appears perpetually young, though she was nearly 50 at her death, and her final illness made her seem much older. Until the 1950s, the belief was that Hannah Callowhill was nearly past marriageable age when she married William Penn, yet she was only 25, three years younger than Gulielma was at marriage. Hannah’s birthdate was traditionally given as 18 April 1664, when her parents named their third child Hannah. The first Hannah died, and her parents preserved her memory by giving her name to their sixth child, the future Hannah Penn, born 11 February 1671. But the image persists of a Hannah Callowhill born in 1664, unable to find a suitable husband until she was nearly thirty, when the portly, middle-aged William Penn proposed and she gratefully accepted. Actually, Hannah and Gulielma both had a series of suitors and were single by choice up until the time they married William Penn.

Both of William Penn’s marriages appear to have been deeply affectionate relationships, but his biographers have portrayed the first as a love match, the second as a matter of convenience. The two women had much in common: both appear to have been wealthy, intelligent, devout, physically attractive, active in Quaker affairs, and astute in business matters. But biographers have divided these talents between them: Gulielma was the beautiful, intellectual, and passionately devout one; Hannah had money, common sense, and “sober” faith. Standard sources refer to “the beautiful and devoted” Gulielma, “a woman of great beauty and saintly character”; Hannah is described as “a loyal and efficient helpmeet.” Film-makers have not been alone in myth-making. A nineteenth-century map showing the locations of the then-unmarked Penn family burial plot lists a grave for Gulielma Springett Penn, but Hannah’s grave is noted only as “Wm Penn & 2d Wife.” Historians have not committed such egregious acts as doing away with Penn’s second wife entirely or leaving out her name, but they have come close.

One biographer, William Hull, describes Gulielma’s burial next to the meetinghouse in Jordans, Buckinghamshire: “She was buried beside her mother in the Friends’ graveyard at Jordans, near the beautiful scenes of their courtship and marriage a score of years before. After another quarter-century of sad, laborious years, her husband was to take his place beside her.” Of course, this account ignores the possibility that there might have been any joy with his second wife, who was buried there as well, eight years after her husband’s death. Hull does at least include a section on Hannah; other historians have devoted little attention to her or left her out completely.
Historians have created images of the two women for which there is little or no supporting evidence. Gulielma was said to possess startling beauty, a serious mien, evenness of temper, and a sensitive nature that made her susceptible to illness. Biographers have characterized Hannah as “excellent, capable, broad-minded, a hard-fibred English woman, with a superior understanding, great prudence, energy, talent and remarkable business ability.” In other words, Gulielma wore the glass slippers, while Hannah wore sturdy English walking shoes. Hannah was not quite the ugly stepsister—although Gulielma’s son, William Penn, Jr., certainly saw her as the wicked stepmother. The characterizations of both women, from their own time to the present, definitely bear some resemblance to fairy tales. An examination of the real and imagined differences between them can provide insight into the continuity and change in stereotypical images of women from their time to ours.

There were real and important differences between the two women. Gulielma was the first wife, her husband’s equal in social class and in age. William Penn and Gulielma Springett were among the few Friends who belonged to the gentry. From the perspective of non-Quakers as well as Quakers, their marriage was an ideal match. Hannah was half her husband’s age when they married, and from the merchant class rather than gentility. But differences in the historical images of the two women derive less from the facts of their lives and more from the interplay of three sets of semi-mythical images: traditional views of early Quakerism; heroic myths of William Penn and early Pennsylvania; and persistent stereotypes of women, love, and marriage.

Most of the basic facts of Gulielma’s and Hannah’s lives are undisputed. Gulielma Maria Springett, born a few months before William Penn in 1644, was the posthumous daughter of Sir William Springett, a lawyer and a knight who died while fighting on Cromwell’s side during the English Civil War. Gulielma was born a few weeks after her father’s death; about ten years later, her mother, Mary, married Isaac Penington, Jr., the eldest son of Isaac Sr., the Puritan Lord Mayor of London. Both Isaac and Mary Penington thought of themselves as Seekers, searching for religious truth, and they were part of the in-gathering of like-minded people that constituted the early Quaker movement when it took hold in London in the 1650s. The family estate in Buckinghamshire served as a meeting place for Friends, overseen by Mary and Gulielma during Isaac Penington’s several imprisonments.
Gulielma probably met William Penn soon after he became a Quaker in 1667, much to the dismay of his father Admiral Sir William Penn, who had ambitions for his son to be a proper English gentleman, perhaps even to be granted a title. In 1672, a year and a half after his father's death, William Penn and Gulielma Springett were married in proper Quaker fashion and settled at Rickmansworth, outside London, near her parents and his mother. Five years later they moved to a larger house at Warminghurst Manor in Sussex. The couple had eight children, but only three lived past infancy: Springett, Laetitia, and William, Jr. Except for making one journey with her husband right after their marriage, Gulielma seems to have remained at Warminghurst while William traveled to Germany and Holland, throughout England, and to Pennsylvania in 1682-84. After his return and a brief period of prominence as a friend of King James II, Penn was forced into hiding when in 1688 the Glorious Revolution sent the king into exile and the government of Pennsylvania was taken over by the crown. In February 1694, just as her husband was being cleared of charges and regaining control of the colony, Gulielma died following a lengthy illness at the age of 49.

By the end of 1694, while on a ministering tour of the West Country, William Penn had begun to court Hannah Callowhill, a third-generation Quaker whose parents were leaders in the city of Bristol's men's and women's meetings. Her grandfather, Dennis Hollister, was a Baptist deacon when he was selected to serve in the Barebones' Parliament of 1653. While in London, the Baptists said, he "sucked in some principles of this upstart locust doctrine, from a sort of people called Quakers." Dennis and Bridget Hollister then welcomed the first traveling Quaker preachers who visited Bristol in 1654. Their four daughters all became active Quakers and married fellow Friends. The eldest, Hannah Hollister, married Thomas Callowhill in 1660 in one of the first Quaker weddings recorded in Bristol. They had nine children; Hannah Callowhill, Jr., born in 1671, was the sixth child and the only one to survive to adulthood. Dennis Hollister was a grocer, and Thomas Callowhill, a buttonmaker and linendraper. These occupational titles obscure the wealth the family accumulated in Bristol, the leading port of western England, where fortunes were made in both inland and overseas trade.

During Hannah, Jr.'s childhood, Bristol authorities sent Quakers to jail by the hundreds, usually because their refusal to swear kept them from taking the oath of allegiance to the crown. Hannah's father spent at least six months in jail in 1682,
when so many Quakers were imprisoned that the children conducted their own meetings for worship, until even they were arrested. In 1689 the Act of Toleration granted Quakers a measure of relief. William Penn was still in hiding under suspicion of treason, but for most Quakers the period of Hannah's young adulthood was relatively peaceful. The law and the authorities had become more moderate, and Quakerism itself had moderated.

After Hannah married William Penn in 1696, they lived alternately in Bristol and at Warminghurst. Gulielma's eldest son, Springett, died a month after his father's remarriage; later that year Penn published his memorial to his first wife and their son. Hannah accompanied William on his second and final trip to Pennsylvania at the end of 1699. They returned to England within two years, and in 1708 William Penn landed in prison for failure to pay his debts to the heirs of his former steward, to whom he had mortgaged Pennsylvania. William Penn was released from prison when English Quakers bought up the Pennsylvania mortgage. Hannah returned to her parents' residence in Bristol while he searched for a new home, and in 1709 they moved with their five surviving children—John, Thomas, Margaret, Richard, and Dennis—to Ruscombe House in Berkshire. Three years later, William suffered a series of strokes and was incapacitated from 1712 until his death in 1718.

During the final six years of William Penn's life, Hannah managed family affairs, including the Pennsylvania proprietorship. She continued to do so after his death, as executrix of his will and guardian of their children, all minors. Initially, she expressed reservations in her own ability; she hesitated to act "for fear of mismanagement," she said, because she was "but a woman." But she did learn to manage things, and during her tenure as acting proprietor, she presided over two changes of deputy governors; handled negotiations over the longstanding Pennsylvania-Maryland border dispute; battled in the courts with her stepson, William Penn, Jr., over the terms of William, Sr.'s will; and resolved conflicts with the English government over laws passed in Pennsylvania. Until her own death in 1726, Hannah Penn remained involved in all these affairs, and her sons and grandsons remained proprietors of Pennsylvania down to the American Revolution.

These basic biographical facts are known, but evidence about the character and personality of these two women is much more problematic. As with most women of the period, sources for Gulielma Penn's life are sparse, making it particu-
larly difficult to sort fact from fiction. The existing primary sources consist of a few contemporary commentaries, her mother's autobiography, her husband's memorial essay on her, and just five of her letters. For Hannah, there are fewer printed sources—no published commentaries, no memorial, no family autobiographies—but many more manuscript sources, including more than a hundred letters written by her and another hundred to her. Most of these letters date from after William Penn's death, and so have not been used by his biographers.

Gulielma's childhood friend Thomas Ellwood had nothing but praise for her as a potential marriage partner. She was, he said, "in all respects a very desirable Woman (whether regard was had to her outward Person, which wanted nothing to render her completely Comely: or to the Endowments of her mind, which were every way Extraordinary and highly Obliging, or to her outward Fortune, which was fair (and which with some hath not the last, nor the least place in Consideration)." Her kindness, he wrote, was "expressed in an innocent, open, free, and familiar Conversation, springing from the abundant Affability, Courtesy, and Sweetness of her natural Temper." John Aubrey wrote that their marriage "haz been crowned with a continued affection."

Contemporary comments on Hannah were all unpublished. James Logan wrote her uncle Simon Clement that she was "blest with a strong Judgement & excellent good sense to a degree uncommon to her Sex." When the Penns left Pennsylvania in 1701, Isaac Norris wrote: "His Excellent Wife as she is belov'd by all (I believe I may say all in its full Extent) so is Leaving us heavy & of Real Sorrow to her frds. She has carried it under and through all wth a wonderful evenness humility and freedom her sweetness and goodness is become her character & I believe it is Extraordinary. In short we Love her and She deserves it." Contemporary praises both women as humble, sweet, and guileless; the difference is that the comments about Gulielma were printed soon after her death and were widely reprinted, while comments on Hannah remained in manuscript form until the nineteenth century and never found a wide audience.

This difference also exists for William Penn's own written sentiments about his wives. During his lifetime, he published a memorial to Gulielma, his "Excellent Wife, and Mother . . . and constant Friend." Beginning in 1761, printed versions of his 1682 letter to Gulielma and their children appeared frequently. In that letter, written as he was about to embark for Pennsylvania for the first time (and prepar-
ing for his own possible death at sea), William Penn wrote to Gulielma: “Remember thou wast the love of my youth, and much joy of my life; the most beloved, as well as the most worthy of all my earthly comforts.” Other unpublished letters echoed these sentiments. Before his return voyage in 1684, he wrote to her “as my beloved one, the true & great Joy & crown of my life above all visible comforts, allways valued by me, & honored above women.” Four days after Gulielma’s death in 1694, he wrote that she was “one of 10000, wise, chaste, humble, plain, modest, industrious, constant, & undaunted.” This sort of documentary evidence—memorials and farewell letters—is clearly not the stuff of everyday correspondence between husband and wife. Gulielma’s own letters, the few that have survived, are in the formulaic style used by Quakers to encourage each other and offer few insights into her individual personality. The surviving documents themselves—limited in number, formally written, often intended for a public audience—began the process of creating an idealized image of Gulielma Penn.

Most of the documentary evidence on William Penn’s opinion of his second wife is in personal, unpublished letters. Since she outlived him, he could not write a memorial; nor did he write any farewell letters, since she accompanied him on his visit to Pennsylvania from 1699-1701. But there are two series of letters from husband to wife: courtship letters, written between late 1695 and early 1696; and letters written in 1709-10, when Penn was hunting for a house near London and writing to his family in Bristol. They contain flowery professions of love, similar to those he made to Gulielma, but they provide a more intimate profile of the marital relationship than the more public documents that exist for his first marriage.

During the first three months of 1696, after William and Hannah had already appeared before the Friends Bristol Men’s Meeting to gain consent to their marriage, he wrote several letters reassuring her that he loved her; she was “amiable in my eye, above many” and “my heart, from the very first, has cleaved to thee.” His letters also indicate that there were real conflicts at the start of the relationship, principally because Hannah was unsure of William Penn’s motivations in marrying her and sensed some disjunction between his behavior and Quaker ideology about marriage, which he himself had helped to formalize. She feared that a third party had encouraged him to seek her out; that he was attracted to her because of her money; that he felt his spiritual stature made him irresistible; and that he was forcing her into a relationship that she was not sure she wanted. She herself had
planned on not marrying at all, she had told him early on, but had resolved instead to dedicate herself to Quaker work. In his inimitable fashion, he reassured her that she could serve the Lord by marrying him: “since thou wert for liveing to the Lord, as thy Husband, thou thus marryest him in me.”

Mythmaking becomes all the easier when there is little documentary evidence. From the limited evidence, historians have drawn contrasts between the two women. Biographers give lengthy quotations from Aubrey and Ellwood to describe Gulielma’s effusive appearance and personality. Hannah is simply “capable Hannah.” William Penn’s first marriage has been depicted as the quintessential Quaker love match, the second as a cut-and-dry, business-like affair.

Early biographies of William Penn began the pattern of extensively treating Gulielma and only briefly mentioning Hannah. Joseph Besse’s biography, published in 1726, the year Hannah died, prints Penn’s 1682 farewell letter to Gulielma and their children, as well as his account of her death. In Besse’s portrayal, William Penn had a deeply loving relationship with the “virtuous,” “comely,” and “well accomplished” Gulielma. His second marriage was one of “comfortable cohabitation” with the “sober and religious” Hannah.

Early nineteenth-century Pennsylvania historians devoted more attention to Hannah than their English peers or than later historians on either side of the Atlantic. In her transcriptions of Penn family correspondence, Deborah Logan wrote of Hannah as “a delicate and pretty woman, [seen] sitting beside the cradle of her infant.” (Logan included Hannah Penn’s letters in spite of the criticism of fellow Philadelphia historian John Watson, who at first thought the letters were trivial.) Watson himself came to see in Hannah a role model for American women:

Such a modest, unassuming, and diffident female, conducting such a national concern in the midst of her proper household avocations, with such complete but unpretending ability, is probably without a parallel. Let good wives read [her letters], that they may instruct themselves and teach their daughters to emulate her usefulness in like cases of family bereavements or extremities.

To Logan and Watson, Hannah’s life was a compelling argument for women’s education, so that they might be prepared in case their husbands were incapacitated. But the expansion of women’s education in the nineteenth century had other effects as well. As women increasingly agitated for their rights, biographers reverted
to romantic imagery with a vengeance. By the early twentieth century, a highly romanticized vision of Gulielma emerged in popular biographies of William Penn. A 1900 narrative spoke of Penn’s “romance” with “a very pretty Quaker maiden who had captured his fancy,” a “tantalizing young woman.” Sydney George Fisher asserted that “to this day there are Pennsylvanians who regret that they could not be ruled in colonial times by Guli’s sons.” In Hannah, William Penn was not looking for romance but simply “wanted a wife, someone who would look after his children.” Although she was “homely,” according to Bonamy Dobrée, Hannah fit the bill because she was “not too young, experienced in the world, with sound instincts.”

Later biographies based on manuscript sources provided more balance. In her 1956 biography, Catherine Peare admitted that the proprietor’s second marriage was “another love match” like the first, but, she added, it “lacked the mutual growth of the first.” But in the 1970s two biographers rose to even more fanciful heights than those of the early 1900s. Admitting that there were no extant love letters between William and Gulielma, Hans Fantel wrote, “It was inevitable that William and Guli fell in love. . . . Each could see in the other a living image of his own innermost aspiration, transfigured by eros. As lovers, William and Guli idealized each other. But there was nothing false in this idealization, for each embodied the other’s own essential truth.” On the other hand, Hannah, according to Fantel, “was hardly a woman to rekindle an aging man’s passions. By all accounts, she appears to have been sturdy and good-hearted, plain in appearance, competent in practical matters, and with an ordinary mind.” Fantel dismisses William Penn’s courtship letters to Hannah as an effort that “allowed her the illusion of romance.”

Harry Wildes added his own fanciful notions that Hannah was haunted by Gulielma’s memory. “It is not unthinkable that Hannah sometimes cried a bit” because her husband continued to wear around his neck a gold piece that belonged to Gulielma. (Wildes omits that the original owner was William Penn’s mother, whose memory might also have been important.) He also draws an imaginary scene of William Penn writing the Account of Gulielma’s death after his marriage to Hannah in 1696: “To what must have been Hannah’s dismay, her husband sat down to tell the Quaker world how wonderful his life had been with Guli.” But Penn’s essay was actually written in 1694; he published it later to accompany the account of his son Springett’s death in 1696.
Where there is real evidence for aspects of the myth, the two women seem more alike than opposite. In many areas there just is not enough credible evidence. The myth of Gulielma's extraordinary beauty and Hannah's plain looks is a case in point. There are reputed portraits of Gulielma and Hannah, but none is convincingly authenticated. Quakers customarily shunned having their portraits done, and both women followed Quaker guidelines in all other aspects of their lives. Contemporaries called Gulielma “completely comely.” Praise for Hannah’s appearance was less effusive; observers called her “unexceptionable,” that is, there was nothing wrong with her. William Penn told each of his wives that he loved her for her inner beauty, but he also alluded to physical attractiveness. He told Hannah that he loved her for “the loveliness that the tendering & blessed Truth hath beautified thee with”; he wrote Gulielma that he was prompted “more [by] thy inward than thy outward excellencies.”

Both women appear to have been deeply religious. Ellwood and Aubrey, as well as William Penn, attest to Gulielma's devout faith. Quaker records show that she was active in women's meetings in Sussex at least during the early years of her marriage. Hannah's name appears in the Sussex minutes in the 1690s and early 1700s, and she attended the Reading Women's Half-Yearly Meeting when the family lived at Ruscombe. Gulielma may have served as clerk to the meeting at times; Hannah does not appear to have played any particular role, although her name was regularly listed first among the participants, as was Gulielma's.

Neither Gulielma nor Hannah was a Quaker minister, although they might have been had they not married William Penn. Gulielma did travel “for Truth's sake” before marriage and in her first few weeks of married life. There is no indication that Hannah ever traveled in the Quaker cause, unless accompanying her husband to Pennsylvania can be counted as such. Both wrote letters indicating their strong faith, although only Hannah's letters speak of participation in Quaker activities such as collecting clothing or money for poor relief and preparing food and lodging for visiting Yearly Meeting representatives. For both women, caring for the household, with an often absent husband, took so much effort that they had little time to participate in Quaker activities themselves.

The documents never mention either woman speaking in meetings, and the references to both women as humble, sweet, and modest may indicate that they were silent in meetings for worship. In one letter to her son Thomas, Hannah
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expressed a preference for “the happiness of silence in meetings.” Other letters reveal her resolve to dress plainly and her fears that her children were succumbing to the temptation of fashion instead of following her example. In 1717, she urged fifteen-year-old Thomas to make sure his hat was “tack[e]d up in a very frien[d]ly like way, for the fantastical cocks in thine, & thy brother Johns hats, has burthened my spiritt much.” Simple dress symbolized an entire way of life to her. “I have a multitude of toyls and cares,” she told Thomas, “but they would be greatly middigated if I may but behold thee & thy brother, persuing hard after virtue, and leaveing as behind your backs the toyish allurements & snares of this uncertain world.” As with other well-to-do Friends, though, Quaker simplicity for the Penns did not mean buying inexpensive goods; Hannah often purchased expensive fabrics in simple shades of tan or gray.

Legal documents show that Hannah personally held to the Quaker testimony against oaths, and her letters to Pennsylvanians show a concern that the colony’s laws continue to be in accord with Quaker principles. For example, she was worried in 1713 when Queen Anne was threatening to veto “some of the most Meteriall [laws] for the people,” including Pennsylvania’s Affirmation Act, which would have allowed Quakers to give evidence in court without taking an oath.

Gulielma’s letters show that she was well-educated. Her penmanship and her spelling were both more accomplished than most other Quaker women of the period, including Hannah Callowhill. She undoubtedly had private tutors, as her younger brothers and sisters did. Thomas Ellwood, her childhood friend and the tutor of her half-brothers and sister, wrote that “the endowments of her Mind . . . were in every way extraordinary.” At least one letter demonstrates knowledge of the legal system as it was being used against Quakers. Since early Quaker women were prosecuted with the men for a variety of offenses, both sexes probably learned more than their fellow citizens about basic legal procedures. Gulielma was also noted for her medical expertise, passed down from her grandmother.

In defending her childrens’ inheritance against the claims of Gulielma’s offspring, Hannah showed far more knowledge of the law than most women of her era. As acting proprietor, she had to supervise the procedure of gaining royal approbation for laws passed in Pennsylvania. She also demonstrated medical knowledge during the illnesses of her husband, children, and servants, though she belonged to a time which the well-to-do turned frequently to professional male physicians.
Hannah’s education was not as complete as Gulielma’s, and she had a sense of inadequacy in writing letters to her future husband. She may have attended the Friends’ school in Bristol, but authorities forced it to close and imprisoned the schoolmaster in 1682, when she was eleven. She was past school age when the school reopened in 1690 with Patrick Logan and later his son James as schoolmaster. George Fox had recommended schools “for instructing girls and young maidens in whatsoever things were civil and useful,” and Hannah did receive the necessary knowledge for a merchant’s daughter. In spite of her insecurity, her handwriting was clear and her spelling only slightly more inconsistent than that of the Oxford-educated William Penn. She learned basic arithmetic and perhaps some simple accounting skills.

Whatever the inadequacies in her education, Hannah Penn possessed a lively interest in learning. After her husband became incapacitated, she quickly absorbed the knowledge she needed to protect not only her own family’s legal interests but also those of Pennsylvania Quakers. She learned enough about geography to understand the Pennsylvania-Maryland boundary dispute. She learned the rudiments of double-entry bookkeeping and used it in keeping her accounts from 1715 to 1719, when her son John took over the family books. (She dropped the double-entry method quickly, perhaps because she only needed one column: her accounts consist almost entirely of money going out, with almost nothing coming in.) In at least one letter to proprietary secretary James Logan, she demonstrated an interest in natural science, shared with her husband and with Logan. In 1715 she asked Logan if Pennsylvania had experienced the “Great Eclips of the Sun wch was so Extream here that for about 3 Minutes I could not see to discern one Child frm another. the Stars were also Visible.”

From the extant evidence, both women clearly shared admirable qualities, yet historians have drawn sharp distinctions between them for several reasons. First, Gulielma and Hannah represent different eras and types of Quakerism. Gulielma’s life epitomizes the version of early Quaker history that Quakers were most eager to preserve. Second, William Penn’s first marriage fits the historical imagery of early Pennsylvania, which has focused on the colony’s first twenty years and on William Penn’s first stay in the colony rather than his second. Finally, William Penn’s marriage to Gulielma has been used to symbolize the newly emergent ideal of companionate marriage in the second half of the seventeenth century. His mar-
riage to Hannah represented an inherent contradiction to the companionate ideal of two perfect soulmates; a remarriage was an unpleasant reminder that even an ideal marriage could be cut short by death, and that it was possible to love more than one person in a lifetime.  

Seventeenth-century Quakers were superb publicists. Almost from the start, they were active in creating their own historical image. The dominant image was that of faithful yeoman farmers and shopkeepers, and their wives, patiently enduring persecution at the hands of the authorities and the mob for the sake of the Truth. The Meeting for Sufferings carefully collected and preserved records of Friends’ “sufferings”—imprisonment, fines, physical punishment, even death—in defense of Quaker refusal to take oaths or to pay either tithes to support the established church or taxes to support war. In writing their own history, Quakers placed less emphasis on the other side of their early years, the aggressive, combative, and even potentially blasphemous behavior of some of their more fanatical believers. Among these was Hannah’s grandfather, Dennis Hollister, who accused the Broadmead Baptist Church of prostituting God’s word in tracts entitled The Skirts of the Whore Discovered and The Harlot’s Veil Removed. Hollister and fellow Bristol Quakers attacked civil authorities in The Cry of Blood and Herod, Pontius Pilate, and the Jews reconciled, and in conspiracy with the Dragon, to devour the Manchild. Like other Quaker pamphlets of the period, these tracts constituted direct and personal attacks on the local ruling class, both civil and ecclesiastical. Gulielma’s mother and stepfather wrote material of a very different sort, pious and mystical autobiography.  

Quaker history-writers emphasized the early heroic days of the movement over the later period of accommodation, and they have stressed only selected aspects of the early period, submission to persecution rather than combativeness. By the early 1700s, the aggressive stance of early Friends was thereafter identified as the behavior of a few disruptive individuals, generally female. To point up Quaker simplicity, Quakers emphasized their rural origins and downplayed their urban experience. When they did write about urban Friends, the focus was on London, not Bristol. Gulielma Penn’s marriage in rural Buckinghamshire fit the Quaker imagery far better than did Hannah Penn’s in the Bristol meetinghouse. Gulielma’s genteel family and her Quaker mystic stepfather, Isaac Penington, were more desirable models of early Quakerism than Hannah’s merchant-class family and her outspoken grandfather, Dennis Hollister.
Gulielma Penn’s story fits the preferred historical image of Pennsylvania and its founder. Biographers of William Penn have devoted many more pages to Gulielma’s story than to Hannah’s in part because they have spent more time on their husband’s early life than his later years. They have concentrated on his period of greatest creativity—when he wrote the Frame of Government, promoted the colony, met with the Indians for the first time—and slighted the later period, when he was constantly complaining about Pennsylvanians’ ingratitude and failure to pay what they owed him. This historiographical trend began with the earliest biographers, who have preferred to detail the “halcyon period of Penn’s career,” with its “air of hopeful and buoyant cheerfulness.” More recent historians have followed this pattern as well. The story of Pennsylvania’s founding years is a more dynamic one than that of the early 1700s, when Pennsylvania was paralyzed by dissension and violence and when William Penn became so exasperated with the colonists that he negotiated to sell his powers of government to the Crown.

The later story is also a complicated one. Historians have found it easier to leave out the period 1712-1726, when Hannah Penn was acting proprietor, than to discuss all the legal and political complexities of William Penn’s will, which separated the government from the soil and named twelve trustees on both sides of the Atlantic to handle the whole tangled mess. It has been simpler to omit William Penn, Jr.’s lawsuit contesting the will, which was heard in three separate civil and ecclesiastical courts over an eight-year period. Even William Penn omitted from his will the mortgage of Pennsylvania to a large group of English Quakers, administered by eight trustees. During this period, Hannah Penn was at the center of all these various groups, each of which had a role, or at least a claim to a role, in Pennsylvania’s government. She could not act alone, but she was vitally involved with all the competing interests involved in Pennsylvania’s government.

Hannah’s later activities as acting proprietor have received mention from Pennsylvania historians, but often her role is misunderstood or ignored. They have downplayed Hannah Penn’s stewardship in part because of the complexities of her position. They have treated her husband as an active agent during his illness, referred to her actions as acts of “the Penn family,” and used the impersonal passive voice when describing her actions. Gary B. Nash, for example, mentions Hannah’s name but then reports that “[Governor] Keith was replaced by Patrick Gordon”; the use of the passive conveniently avoids a complex discussion of all the signato-
ries to the new appointment. Illick discusses the complexities of the proprietor's will but employs the generic "Penn family" when referring to decisions and appointments in which Hannah had the central role. Occasionally, historians have even made her the scapegoat for her husband's failings, as when Herbert Levi Osgood held her accountable for the attempt to sell Pennsylvania's government to the Crown, a sale William Penn had been trying mightily to effect for several years before his stroke.\(^7\)

More recently, Hannah Penn's role in Pennsylvania history has been oversimplified by giving her sole authority over the colony, which she never had. In 1983, when Congress granted William and Hannah Penn honorary citizenship in the United States, she was cited as "the first woman Governor in North America," an ahistorical title that she would have thought odd indeed.\(^7\) She may have reached the upper limits of political power for women in early eighteenth-century Anglo-America, but she occupied a special status as "proprietress." The title "governor" was reserved for male proprietors or their male surrogates.

Gulielma's involvement in Pennsylvania was marginal; her role seems to have been to oversee the management of her own and her husband's estates in the 1680s while he was away, promoting the sale of Pennsylvania lands and governing the colony in person. The documents are silent on her awareness of Pennsylvania affairs; only brief mentions of the colony have survived in letters to Margaret Fox.\(^7\) Gulielma is notable as an English Quaker, but Hannah falls between the cracks of traditional divisions in the historical profession: except for two years spent in Pennsylvania, she lived in England, yet her noteworthiness comes from her involvement with America. Like her husband, she existed in the Anglo-American Atlantic world that has recently become the focus of colonial historians, yet those histories that span the Atlantic have concentrated so far on men's activities.\(^8\)

As William Penn's first wife, Gulielma's life fits the pattern of first love, a subject prone to mythologizing in popular culture then and now. A second marriage is presumed to be based more on realistic appraisals of character and mutual need. Characterizations of Gulielma and Hannah Penn by historians and biographers fit these stereotypes of romantic first love and pragmatic remarriage.\(^8\)

Much of Hannah's myth is related to the simple fact that she was the second wife, and therefore not the first, only, and true love. A month before their marriage, William Penn was still trying to reassure Hannah that she had made the right
decision in agreeing to marry him. She had expressed doubts that she felt only friendship for him, not love. “Deare & best frds we shall ever be,” he answered, “and a life of Truth & Tenderness, & Devotion, I hope we shall live, & after Leah, Rebecca may follow, & then Inclination may follow Judgemt & both meet to Compleat thy felicity.” 82 Like most Quakers—and many others—of his time, Penn was comfortable with Biblical parables, although his memory occasionally failed him: here he confuses Jacob’s mother Rebecca with his second wife Rachel. William Penn knew that Hannah, like any contemporary reader, would remember that Jacob worked for seven years to marry the beautiful Rachel, only to be tricked by her father into marrying her older sister Leah; and that after seven more years of servitude, he married Rachel as well. Penn saw nothing odd in trying to encourage his second bride-to-be with a Biblical story about a first and second marriage. If taken literally, he might even seem to be hinting that for him the second marriage was to be to his real love. Of course he was speaking only figuratively. But historians have turned the parable on its end and made Hannah seem to be Leah—the dutiful, commonsensical, and utilitarian wife—to Gulielma’s Rachel, the true love.

Linda Ford writes of Gulielma, “Penn’s [first] marriage was by all accounts a very happy one and a very loving one. His wife was gifted, highly intelligent, devout and courageous. She strengthened his belief that the kind of womanly virtues she possessed were praiseworthy, while impressing on him through her strength the necessity for more egalitarianism in marriage.” About Hannah, Ford says: “If Penn was searching for a wife to take care of him in his latter years, he could not have done better than the faithful and deserving Hannah.... Mrs. Penn was the perfect example of what Penn considered the ideal wife as helpmeet, the sort of caretaker he needed in his old age; a role much like the one his mother had fulfilled for him, while Gulielma had been the perfect example of ideal wife as friend, lover, and partner.” 83 This interpretation overlooks the evidence that William Penn appeared as much a fool in love at age 50 as he had been at age 25, and that there is much more extant evidence for affection, even passion, within his second marriage than for his first.

Hannah and Gulielma alike seem to have held to a belief in companionate marriage, with one important difference. According to William Penn, Gulielma was “sweetly consenting and satisfied” to follow her husband’s wishes, either to travel to join him or to stay behind. Hannah was more demanding. According to
rumor, he promised to live with her in Bristol in exchange for her £10,000 dowry. In 1703, when she was in Bristol and her husband in London, she complained, “I cannot with any Satisfaction endure thy absence much Longer.” She then moderated her complaint, closing the letter: “all desire to salute thee, but none so dearly as her that with Great Patience, as well as great satisfaction, is / Thine own HP.” But the need to be together was not only on her side; he too expressed regret at his separation from “my ould & beloved bedfellow.” William and Hannah Penn relied on each other for emotional support. Throughout their courtship and marriage he felt constrained to come to her or to meet her halfway. Given William Penn’s constant travels, this was an important issue.

Both women clearly influenced the decision of where the couple would make their married home. Gulielma’s and William’s home at Rickmansworth was near her childhood home; their next home at Warminghurst was part of her inheritance. William moved to Bristol to live with Hannah, and their decision to live at Ruscombe was determined by the ease of travel from there to Bristol as well as to London. Paradoxically, it was the demanding Hannah, not “sweetly consenting” Gulielma, who succeeded in making the voyage to Pennsylvania with her husband. Gulielma spoke of going, and waited for word whether she should join her husband, but her poor health prevented her. Hannah could have stayed home for health reasons as well, since she was five months pregnant when the ship sailed, but she made the voyage anyway.

Hannah and Gulielma alike believed that wives ideally belonged with their husbands. Gulielma hinted at some criticism of Margaret Fell Fox for living separately from George Fox, then her husband of fifteen years: “Me thinks if thou foundest a Clearness & Freedom in the Lord, it would be happie thou wert nearer thy deare Husband & Children, but that I leave [to] the Lords ordering, & thy freedom.” Hannah expressed concern that Sybella Masters return home to Pennsylvania, where her husband and children were, after overstaying her visit to England to patent her invention for milling corn. “I hope she is prevailed upon to attempt [the return voyage],” Hannah wrote, “for the good of herself and family.”

Gulielma and Hannah Penn lived on the cusp between traditional marriage and companionate marriage, and so historians have been able to interpret their lives as fitting into either pattern. Eighteenth-century Quaker historians emphasized Gulielma because she represented the movement’s early, heroic period; the
vigorous years of William Penn’s life; and idealized notions of Quaker marriage. Nineteenth-century Pennsylvania writers briefly elevated Hannah Penn to the status of role model. Influenced by Deborah Logan, John Watson came to regard Hannah as the ideal wife, humble but competent enough to fill in for her husband when the need arose. Twentieth-century biographers raised Gulielma onto a pedestal, as a quiet, supportive, stay-at-home wife who provided a useful counter-image to activist, feminist women of their own times. It is surely no accident that Gulielma appeared most saintly in the early 1900s, as the women’s suffrage movement took hold, and in the 1970s, when feminists were calling for equal rights.

Women’s historians have paid little attention to either Gulielma or Hannah. Gulielma of course does not figure in American women’s history textbooks, but Hannah is most conspicuous by her absence. In the two decades that American women’s historians have been “making the invisible woman visible,” only one book, a survey of women in the economy, mentions Hannah. The entry in Notable American Women provides some remedy for her invisibility, but it also perpetuates some of the mythology. English Quaker women’s history has focused more on the seventeenth than the eighteenth century and so has included Gulielma’s experience, but not Hannah’s. Some American Quaker women’s historians have included discussions of William Penn’s wives, but most have not, since Gulielma never came to America and Hannah only spent two years in Pennsylvania. In addition, most research in the area has focused either on ideas about women or on the development of institutions such as women’s meetings and philanthropic organizations.

Mary Maples Dunn recognizes that biography has been “the first stage” in both women’s history and Quaker history, yet many of the early biographies of “women worthies” like Gulielma and Hannah Penn fail to put their subjects in a broader historical context. Modern women’s historians have focused on the lives of women ministers and martyrs, women who engaged in autonomous action. But neither Hannah nor Gulielma lived autonomous lives apart from their husband and families, and so they have not become part of the feminist narrative of women’s history.

The mythologizing of Gulielma Penn has been all the easier because there is so little documentation of her relationship with her husband. On the other hand, historians have had to ignore and oversimplify the documentary record in order to mythologize Hannah Penn. Like an uncontroversial Supreme Court nominee,
Gulielma left no paper trail. Hannah Penn did. She expressed her opinions about people and issues, and many of her opinions—on slavery, on women’s “place”—would not be favorably received today. Gulielma’s opinions are largely invisible to the modern reader, and so she can maintain her place on the pedestal. She may, like Hannah, have showed impatience and anxiety as well as saintly patience. Unless some treasure trove of family letters is uncovered, the historical Gulielma Penn will never emerge to challenge the myth. But the historical Hannah Penn can and should take the place of the mythical “capable Hannah.” She was, indeed, capable, but a good deal more remains to be said.
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