

“Good Will to all men . . . from the King on the throne to the beggar on the dunghill”: William Penn, the Roman Catholics, and Religious Toleration

Paul Douglas Newman*
University of Kentucky

“To speak the whole truth concerning Penn is a task which requires some courage,” the great English historian Thomas Babington Macaulay wrote, “for he is rather a mythical than a historical person.”¹ Macaulay had no idea how difficult subsequent historians would find the task of discerning “the whole truth.” Many have praised Penn’s liberal thought and actions concerning religious toleration so highly that the results verge on hagiography.² Others have studied Penn the proprietor, writing countless books and articles on his “Holy Experiment” in Pennsylvania.³ Considering this multitude of Penn studies it would appear that historians have answered all of the important questions about the Great Quaker. Nevertheless, few of these publications analyze both his religious and political thought within a transatlantic historical context. Therefore, at least one major question remains a mystery.

Until the accession of James II, Penn spent his entire religious and political career striving for religious toleration which most emphatically excluded Roman Catholics. Like most English people, Penn loathed the rituals of Catholicism and suspected that the Pope was plotting to restore Roman Catholicism as the established church of England.⁴ During the seventeenth century, Parliament sought to protect the nation from Popery and to fortify the Church of England by enacting the Test and Corporation Acts. This legislation compelled conformity to the established Anglican Church by demanding oaths, enforcing penal laws, and excluding dissenters from political participation. Yet while these laws focused primarily on Papists, they also afflicted the various non-conforming Protestant sects that had erupted both during the Civil War and under the Protectorate. The Corporation Act of 1661 hit the Quakers especially hard for their refusal to swear oaths. High Church Anglicans had long suspected that Quakers were actually recusant Catho-

lics. Hundreds of Quakers incurred heavy fines, lost their property, and suffered long jail sentences as dissenters and supposed papists.⁵

Between 1668 and the accession of James II, Penn authored over forty books and pamphlets devoted to alleviating the persecution of Quakers and other Protestant dissenters, while still demanding protection for the country from "that Romish Whore."⁶ He did so not only to distance his own sect from the Catholics, but also because he believed that papists were a political threat. Following the Popish Plot crisis of 1679 Penn actively supported the Whigs in their attempts to exclude the Catholic Duke of York from hereditary succession.⁷ But suddenly, in 1685, he entered a political alliance with James II and added Roman Catholics to his pleas for a universal toleration of Christian sects in England.⁸

Penn's seeming political and religious somersault has baffled historians and embarrassed some of his admirers. Richard and Mary Maples Dunn, co-editors of *The Papers of William Penn* (1981), note that "[i]t has long puzzled historians that W[illiam] P[enn], a notable champion of religious toleration and of participatory government, had a client-patron relationship with James II, the most bigoted and autocratic of Stuart Kings."⁹ They point out that the absence of Penn's personal papers for the years 1685-88 has made explanation of the affiliation difficult. Most often, historians accuse Penn of compromising his principles. They attribute his apparent inconsistency to pecuniary greed or to the interests of his own sect.¹⁰

Moreover, while historians portray Penn as inconsistent or contradictory none, as yet, has analyzed the partnership by examining Penn's publications.¹¹ Speculation is unnecessary, for the answer can be found in his tracts. When set in their political context, the inconsistencies vanish and Penn emerges not as contradictory or compromising, but as steady and logical. Penn did not make his decision to add Roman Catholics to his campaign for toleration overnight. Rather, thirteen years of study and the Pennsylvania experience not only annexed the Catholics to his cause, but also swung Penn from Parliament to Court in his quest for toleration. Penn's great goal, throughout his religious and political career, was to reshape and unify the spiritually divided English nation under the banner of Christianity. Although from the 1670s to the 1680s he shifted the political medium for attaining this design, he remained consistent in that ultimate objective. As Penn once wrote, his "civil conduct" always aimed to promote "peace on Earth, and good will to *all* men, from the King on the throne to the beggar on the dunghill."¹²

From the onset of his literary career to the accession of James, Penn loathed the tenets of Catholicism and dreaded the possibility of its restoration to governmental power. Therefore, he opposed legal toleration as vehemently as any Protestant. His chief objective was to relieve only Quakers and other non-conforming Protestant dissenters from persecution under the penal laws of the Test and Corporation Acts, but not merely for reasons religious. Penn objected to the laws on political grounds as well. The Corporation Act of 1661 denied civil office for those who refused to swear oaths of supremacy and allegiance, and the Test Act of 1673 closed civil and military offices specifically to Catholics and dissenters. They denied non-conformists political representation in local and national government. Officials enforced various penal laws without jury trials, convicting dissenters who refused to swear oaths of allegiance, rejected Anglican communion, or failed to pay tithes. Catholics and Protestant dissenters alike suffered fines, imprisonment, and confiscation of their property.

Penn found these laws unreasonable. Not only did they force conformity through persecution, but they also denied dissenters their "fundamental" English rights: property, representation, and trial by jury. Furthermore, Penn abhorred these laws because Parliament had designed them to deter Catholicism. He complained that those who support the national Church "persecute us for a sort of concealed Papists," and "yet if we must still suffer, let us not suffer as Popish-Recusants, but as Protestant-Dissenters."¹³

Englishmen had long suspected that Quakers were recusant Catholics because they refused to swear oaths. In 1605, the nation blamed the Pope for directing English Catholics in an attempt to assassinate King and Parliament in the "Gunpowder Plot."¹⁴ Catholics divided their loyalties and English Protestants tagged all papists as traitors. Lawmakers then drafted the Oath of Allegiance in 1606 to root out Catholics from civil government, and Catholics became notorious for declining to swear oaths which required them to pledge their loyalty to the King and England while denying their fealty to the Pope and the Roman Catholic Church. Decades later, Friends refused to swear oaths because Quaker beliefs held that oaths were unnecessary for honest people and denied the presence of "the inner light" which alone guaranteed sincerity. Yet to most English, the Quaker refusal to swear in the 1660s and 1670s colored them as "concealed Papists," who together with a large body of Roman Catholic recusants stood ready to someday reclaim England

for the Pope. Penn desperately sought to distance himself and the Quakers from the Roman Catholics in the pre-James years in order to ease toleration for dissenters. However, this was not the sole reason for his anti-Catholicism. Like most English people of the day, Penn too feared the political dangers of Popery.

By alleviating persecution and securing toleration of dissenters, Penn sought to create a Protestant alliance to guard the nation against the infiltration of Popery. In his 1675 *England's Present Interest Discovered*, he argued that the nation's division of Christian sects necessitated a "balance" for a unified Protestant front against their common enemy. Anticipating the objection that toleration of dissenters "makes way for Popery . . . to undermine the Church of England," Penn explained that there was no better expedient to vanquish those fears than "keeping all interests upon the Ballance"; together, the Protestants outnumbered the Catholics six to one. "But," he continued,

if only one interest must be tolerated, which implies a resolution to suppress the rest, plain it is that the Church of England ventures her single party against six growing interests, and thereby gives Popery by far an easier access to Supremacy.¹⁵

Toleration of the Protestant dissenters, Penn theorized, would not threaten the Church of England but actually protect it and all Protestant faiths, as well as the nation, against the Roman Catholic Church.

Yet while Penn refused to include Catholics in his pleas for toleration, he still defended their liberty of conscience as believers in Christ. To modern eyes, there appears an obvious contradiction: how could Penn advocate an unconditional liberty of conscience on the one hand and promote religious toleration solely for Protestants on the other? To a seventeenth-century English mind, however, these were two distinct propositions. This distinction is the most important element for understanding Penn's acceptance of the Catholics and King James II in 1685. The solution to this quandary rests in Penn's explanation of the terms "liberty of conscience" and "toleration."

II

Penn's definition of liberty of conscience contained three components. First, in the spiritual sense, Penn wrote, "I give true Liberty of Soul and Conscience to those only that are set free by the Power of Christ."¹⁶ To him, all Christians enjoyed a natural liberty of conscience. Second, liberty of conscience denounced the imposition of faith by an established church. Espousing the Quaker doctrine of the inner light, Penn maintained that "Faith is the gift of God," not man, "and that what is not faith is Sin!"¹⁷ Forced faith, therefore, denied the operation of God's spirit. Besides impeaching the Lord's honor, the imposition of Anglicanism defied the principles of reason, as all Protestants denounced the concept of spiritual infallibility. "Since they are uncertain and fallible," Penn wondered, "how can they impose upon, or restrain others whom they are so far from assuring, as they are not able to do so much for themselves?"¹⁸ Lastly, liberty of conscience meant freedom from persecution for Christian beliefs. "That which most of all Blackens the Business" of the established Anglican Church "is Persecution," because it contradicted the meekness of the Christian religion. Penn maintained that punishment for faith was beyond mortal authority, and only God could judge a person's conscience since He provided the inner light. Defending dissenters, Penn sarcastically asked, "Must they be persecuted here if they do not go against their Conscience, and punished hereafter if they do?"¹⁹

By opposing persecution for conscience's sake, Penn demanded a separation of church and state. "Christianity and Magistracy are two distinct things," he warned, and are dangerous when mixed.²⁰ Just as civil magistrates had no place controlling spiritual affairs, religion should not guide politics. Laws ought to be created solely to benefit and preserve civil society, not in accordance with principles of faith.²¹ If magistrates adhered to these criteria, Penn believed, civil law would naturally conform to the spiritual law of Christianity, permitting it to be preached, and thus eliminating the need for an established religion which denied liberty of conscience.

From his own definition, then, it is clear that Penn extended liberty of conscience to Catholics as Christians who had a "fundamental right" to believe whatever faith God gave them. No one, Penn maintained, deserved punishment merely for non-conformist Christian beliefs. In fact, he publicly defended Catholics' liberty of conscience on several occasions. In a speech to Parliament, Penn cautioned

that "I am far from thinking it fit that Papists should be whipt for their Conscience. . . . For we have good will to all men, & would have none suffer for a truly sober & conscientious dissent on any hand. . . ." ²² He even prefaced his 1670 condemnation of Popery by disclaiming any intention of "incensing the civil magistrates against them." ²³

Liberty of conscience, however, did not translate to religious toleration, which Penn defined as "the Free and uninterrupted *exercise* of Faith," and the ability to vote and hold public office.²⁴ Here again the spiritual and the civil spheres were to remain separate, because when a religious group challenges or usurps civil authority it has the tendency to force its beliefs upon the citizenry. Therefore, the duty of government was to guard against such threats to order and protect the liberties of its people, especially their liberty of conscience. In spiritual affairs, Penn demanded, civil government can only require conformity to a "General and Practical Religion," tolerating all who profess devotion to the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount, and loyalty to the civil magistrates.²⁵ Papists met the first two requirements, but, in Penn's mind, Catholicism by its nature was *nearly* incapable of fulfilling the last. Penn would offer toleration only to Christian sects whose religious practices did not make them "obstinate and enemies to government."²⁶ Like most of his countrymen, Penn feared the Pope's "Universal Monarchy." Thus, until the accession of James II, he refused to extend the right of liberty of conscience he accorded Roman Catholics to a toleration that would allow the practice of their faith.

Penn feared Catholics' potential destructiveness to civil government and opposed their legal toleration for this reason. He could thus refer to the Catholic Church as "that Romish Whore, who has corrupted Nations," while at the same time extending to Catholics liberty of conscience.²⁷ While by twentieth-century standards this sounds preposterously hypocritical, seventeenth century minds sharply distinguished between the two concepts. Merely by advocating the Papists' right to believe in Roman Catholicism, Penn took an enormous and radical step for the age, whereas most of the nation refused to concede on any matter concerning Popery. Penn's ideas about liberty of conscience were in fact so radical that he found himself continually under attack by his "High Church" adversaries, who accused him of being a Catholic. "For of a long time," Penn lamented in 1678, "I have not only been supposed a Papist, but a Seminary, a Jesuit, an Emissary of Rome & in

pay from the Pope.”²⁸ Obviously then, Penn’s seemingly hairsplitting distinction between liberty of conscience and toleration was an obvious one to his contemporaries. Moreover, it was this crucial distinction that enabled Penn to take the next step and accept Catholics under an umbrella of toleration during James’s reign.

III

Penn’s political fear of Roman Catholics emerged in the first year of his literary career. In 1668 he demanded to know:

What scripture ever made a Pope, or gave authority to anyone to Lord over the Consciences of others. . . . And by what warrantable tradition can he make, dispose, and depose Civil Empires? But above all, when and where did they authorize or Indulge your Cruel, Persecuting, Whipping, Racking, Inquisition, Murdering Spirit?²⁹

His philosophy further crystallized in 1670 with *A Seasonable Caveat Against Popery*. While he demanded that civil magistrates refrain from persecuting Catholics for their faith, Penn warned the nation of their subversive politics. Catholics were incapable of pledging their loyalty separately to both God and man. “[S]uch double cords of Duty cannot tie the hands of men from Murdering their Natural and Religious Princes,” he accused them, and cited the assassinations of Henry III and Henry IV of France as examples.³⁰ Penn explained that Catholics owed their primary spiritual and civil loyalty to the Pope. As long as Catholics professed such allegiances, he maintained that they were natural enemies to civil government.

Penn continued in this vein in 1675, promoting legal toleration only for those sects “who will obey the Civil Magistrates.”³¹ Three years later, he drafted two bills for religious toleration intended for presentation to the House of Commons. Both called for repeal of the penal laws, but in the second he proposed a new test, which read:

I (AB) do hereby declare, that I have no dependence upon the Bishop or Pope of Rome, nor any other Prince or Power on Earth. . . . That I do detest, & abhor that wicked Position, that any Pope can absolve me of my due Allegiance to the King & Governmt of England: And I do promiss by Gods Assistance to live a

sober, peaceable and industrious life under the present Government as established by Law.³²

Penn designed this test primarily for Quakers, as a declaration rather than an oath. While it would allow Quakers and other Protestant dissenters toleration, the test's secondary goal was to exclude Catholics. As long as Penn believed that Catholics posed a threat to government and to the people of England, they were ineligible for his designs of legal toleration.

Penn's political career assumed a new dimension in 1679 with the emergence of the Popish Plot and the rise of the Whig party in the Exclusion Parliaments. When Titus Oats and Israel Tongue claimed knowledge of a papal conspiracy to assassinate Charles II to allow his openly Catholic brother, James, Duke of York, to assume the throne and re-establish the Catholic Church in England, the nation once again threw itself into a frenzy of anti-Catholicism.³³ The Gunpowder Plot had not been forgotten. Several members of Parliament who believed in that body's supremacy over the crown, opposed the Duke's eventual succession to the throne. This Whig party attempted to block by law James's regency.³⁴

Seizing on the wave of anti-Catholicism bred by the "Popish Plot," Penn actively supported the Whigs' exclusion campaign in hopes of drafting legislation to institutionalize toleration for Protestant dissenters.³⁵ Upon the election of the first "Exclusion Parliament," Penn wrote *One Project for the Good of England That is, Our Civil Union is Our Civil Safety*. He beseeched the representatives to tolerate dissenters and thereby create a Protestant alliance against Popery, "for 'tis Government she aims at, to have the reigns of power in her hand, to give law and wield the scepter." Penn argued that it was in the interest of Anglicans as well as Protestant dissenters to unite because "both are like to lose by Pope and Foreign Authority; and if they have but one interest, it will follow that the Church-Protestant cannot prejudice the Dissenting-Protestant, but he must weaken and defray his own interest." Just as "a kingdom divided against itself cannot stand," Penn wrote, "an Interest divided against itself must fall."³⁶

Soon after Charles II prorogued Parliament in January 1679, Penn published *England's Great Interest in the Choice of this New Parliament*. "To be plain with you," he warned, "ALL IS AT STAKE: and therefore I must tell you, That the work of this Parliament is . . . to pursue the Discovery and Punishment of the Plot . . .

that we be secured from Popery and Slavery; and that Protestant-dissenters be eased." To achieve these ends, Penn urged the parliamentary election of Whigs and "such men as will Inviolably maintain Civil Rights for all that will live Soberly and Civilly under the Government." These rights were property, representation, and trial by jury, which Whigs considered "fundamental" to "the Commons of England."³⁷ Penn did not simply support the Whigs to relieve persecuted Quakers. He believed in Whig principles, especially their belief in the government's responsibility to protect the English right to property. When Penn complained of the injustices of religious persecution, he almost always listed the loss of property under the penal laws first among his grievances.³⁸ Just as conscience or faith provided spiritual liberty, property had the capacity of bestowing civil liberty. Penn believed that the paramount responsibility of a representative government was to protect those liberties instead of infringing upon them.

But the question remained how to bring toleration to Protestant dissenters and still exclude Papists? Repeal of the Test Act and penal laws would leave England exposed to Popery. Therefore, Penn proposed a new Test. After a declaration of loyalty to the King, Penn's Test continued:

And I do further sincerely profess, and in good Conscience declare, that I do not believe that the Pope is Christ's Vicar. . . . Nor do I believe there is a Purgatory after Death, or that Saints should be prayed to or Images in any sense be worshipped. Nor do I believe that there is any Transubstantiation. . . . But I do firmly believe, that the present communion of the Roman Catholic Church is both Superstitious and Idolatrous.³⁹

This Test was not unlike the unpublished profession Penn drafted a year before, which all Protestant dissenters could profess but which still excluded Catholics.

Also in 1679, Penn composed *The Great Question to be Considered by the King, and this Approaching Parliament*. "What is the interest of Religion in Policy or Civil Government" Penn asked, "and again, of Policy or Civil Government in Religion?" He demanded that "Christianity and Magistracy are two distinct things," and ought to function separately.⁴⁰ Penn finished the work by defending separation of church and state against the charges that such a government would tolerate Popery and thus endanger the nation. Penn's defense clearly illustrates his meticulous distinction between liberty of conscience and toleration for Catholics: "To

this I answer . . . that Popery has Two parts, the one is that which is merely Religious, this is . . . their beliefs . . . all which may be believed and professed without prejudice to Civil Society." Yet there was more to Popery, Penn continued, "The other part is the opinion of the Pope's power over Princes and States." Because of this opinion, Penn decided that,

they are destructive to Government . . . a politick contrivance long hatched by the Bishop of Rome . . . for establishing to himself a firm Monarchy in the World, and therefore ought to be guarded against and punished by the Magistrates, *not as Errors in Religion but as destructive to the Government.*

Penn carefully prescribed punishment for Catholics based solely on their political disobedience. He never condoned persecution for conscience's sake of any Christians, and so he repeated for the sake of clarity: "*let the reason of our procedure and sentence against them be, not their opinion in things merely Religious, but their destructiveness to Civil Government.*"⁴¹

Even in this, his most anti-Catholic tract, Penn still extended Catholics liberty of conscience. During the most hysterical years of anti-Popery, Penn left a door open for Papists while the rest of the nation wanted it nailed shut. If Catholics could someday, somehow, prove to him that they no longer posed a political threat, Penn could then accept and include them in his demands for religious toleration. But in the year of the Popish Plot, that day seemed likely never to come.

IV

By 1680, William Penn began to realize that the Whigs and the Exclusion Parliaments could neither deliver legislative toleration nor exclude the Catholic Duke of York. With toleration and a non-sectarian government eluding England, Penn pursued another avenue. On June 1, 1680, he called in a debt that the Stuarts owed his father, applying to the Crown for a proprietary charter in North America. By March, 1681, James agreed to transfer his American territory south of New York to Penn in exchange for retirement of the debt.⁴²

For a full year following the Pennsylvania grant, while Penn remained in England to handle proprietary business, he also continued publishing. By this time, it

was certain that the Catholic Duke would become King. Penn was aware of the tenuous nature of proprietary colonies, and understood the royal desire to consolidate the empire. Yet despite this understanding, Penn wrote four vehemently anti-Catholic publications during 1681 and 1682.⁴³ In his 1681 *Protestants' Remonstrance Against Pope and Presbyter*, Penn wrote that Papists "are the greatest of Hypocrites, when by their long prayers they conceal their WHOREDOM, Gluttony, Drunkenness, and Lying: by their Severity to others, they shadow their own wickedness, and by their Canting Religion, disguise their intended Rebellion."⁴⁴ He went on to blame Catholics and Presbyterians for the English Civil War and to warn his countrymen of another should either be tolerated.

Also in 1682, more than a year after the grant, and nearly two since the initial petition, Penn published *Some Sober and Weighty Reasons against Prosecuting Protestant-Dissenters*. In his eleventh reason he explained that all Protestants ought to behave themselves toward each other:

Especially they being all in a like danger of the Bloody Papists, who if ever Government should ever fall into their Bloody hands (which God of his mercy prevent) then the same miseries that may befall the Protestant-Dissenters, will certainly befall the Conforming-Protestants. . . .⁴⁵

These tracts clear up much of the confusion about the origins of Penn's partnership with James II. Some have contended that James bought Penn's loyalty with Pennsylvania, perhaps to use him to garner Whig support.⁴⁶ It is entirely possible that this was James's intention. But in light of Penn's continued attacks upon Popery, it is obvious that he did not consider himself a commodity. Another accusation concerning the grant has been that Penn, by removing to Pennsylvania in 1682, abandoned the radical Whigs and became a conservative proprietor.⁴⁷ While Penn obviously deserted the Whig party, he neither relinquished his whiggish political ideology nor retreated into conservatism. The main point of the "Holy Experiment" was to establish a non-sectarian commonwealth, where the government was based on the consent of its constituents. The tracts quoted above hardly portray a conservative proprietor. Penn was a Whig from start to finish.

Penn spent two years in his commonwealth before returning to England in 1684. He intended a temporary stay at home, lasting no longer than was necessary

to resolve boundary disputes with Maryland and New York, but two factors prevented his return to America for over fifteen years.⁴⁸ His legal battle with the two adjacent colonies dragged on longer than he expected, and the coronation of James II rekindled Penn's hopes for toleration in England.

When Penn arrived home, he immediately established "ordinary access" in the royal court, arguing his case over Pennsylvania's boundaries.⁴⁹ When Charles II died during the winter of 1685, Penn remained at Court when James took the throne since his legal battles with Lord Baltimore and Governor Thomas Dongan of New York persisted. He was undaunted by the new monarch's open Catholicism. In fact, Penn realized that the rise to power of a king who was a member of a persecuted sect offered a new opportunity for toleration. Both desired the repeal of the Test Act and penal laws. However, they realized that these goals remained unattainable while Anglican Tories controlled Parliament. The king needed a new base of support and a new Parliament. So James and Penn made a political deal.⁵⁰ In exchange for James's vow to institute universal toleration, Penn promised to try to rally the Whigs and dissenters for James.⁵¹ Together, James, Penn, and other Whigs attempted to redistribute power from the Church-Tory to the Dissenter-Whig alliance to guarantee the repeal of the penal laws and legislatively institutionalize religious toleration.⁵² Penn hoped that no religion—neither the Roman Catholic nor the Church of England—could tyrannically overtake the government and enforce conformity.

The Penn-James alliance has puzzled historians. Within three years, Penn seemingly altered his politics from those of a radical Whig, who prayed that "God of his mercy prevent" the government from falling into the "Bloody hands . . . of the Bloody Papists," to a conservative courtier of the Catholic James II. On the surface it appears that Penn compromised his principles. Yet considering the historical context of those years in conjunction with the progression of Penn's ideas of toleration, he was again consistent and logical. The only stipulation that had precluded Penn from extending liberty of conscience to toleration for Catholics had been his belief in "their destructiveness to civil government." Once he overcame this fear, Penn simply added Catholics to the other dissenting Christian sects—including his own—for whom he sought toleration. In the 1670s and the years surrounding the Popish Plot, Penn allied with the Whigs in Parliament to pursue a toleration that excluded Catholics because of their supposed political danger. By

1685, he realized that the Catholic threat was more imagined than real, and he turned to the Court to achieve toleration as Church-Tories then controlled Parliament.

A number of factors produced Penn's changed view of Catholics. First and foremost, unlike most English, Penn had always upheld liberty of conscience for Catholics. Because he had accepted their right to believe, he never completely ruled out the possibility of eventual toleration. The unraveling of the Popish Plot in 1681 also eased Penn's assessments of Catholics. As the testimony of Titus Oates and Israel Tongue grew more bizarre, the nation discerned that the plot was a sham.⁵³ Penn made the same observation, and came to understand that the Catholics lacked the power to overrun the nation.

Most important, however, was Penn's personal experience with Catholics in the American colonies and in his own commonwealth. Penn relocated to North America in 1682 to build his model government of toleration based on a separation of church and state. In the "laws agreed upon in England," the addendum to the colony's "Frame of Government," Penn specified that the voting and holding of public office was open to qualified men who "shall be such as profess Faith in Jesus Christ." Lastly, the thirty-fifth law, an addendum to the constitution, read:

That all Persons living in this province, who confess and acknowledge the one Almighty and Eternal God, to be the Creator . . . and that hold themselves obliged in Conscience to live peaceably and justly in Civil Society, shall in no wayes be molested or prejudiced for their Religious Perswasion or Practice in matters of Faith and Worship.⁵⁴

Pennsylvania—the "Holy Experiment"—served as Penn's litmus test for Catholics.

During his first stay in Pennsylvania, 1682-1684, rarely a week passed that Penn did not correspond either with the Catholic governor of New York, Thomas Dongan, or Maryland's Catholic Lord Baltimore concerning property claims.⁵⁵ He also made several visits to each colony. In March, 1683, he wrote a note of thanks to Baltimore, stating, "I must needs hold myself obliged to thee for the Civil Reception I found in Maryland."⁵⁶ In November, 1683, Penn wrote to a Friend, "When I was at New York lately, the new governor [Dongan] though a Papist, with his fine folks came all to meeting."⁵⁷ By the time Penn was preparing to leave for England in 1684, he had spent nearly two years in regular contact with Roman

Catholics, and he became convinced that Catholics, if absorbed into society through a tolerant constitution, would not be dangerous to civil government. In January, 1684, he wrote, "[my] conclusion is short, that there are but two churches in the world, & they contain all the good & bad people in it; of which Christ and Satan are the Heads." ⁵⁸

When Penn returned to London, he continued his experiment in Pennsylvania by recruiting Catholics to emigrate to Philadelphia. In June, 1684, Penn met with John Tatham-Gray, a former Benedictine priest who had married and raised a family, and sold him land in Bucks County.⁵⁹ Penn sent a letter ahead of Gray to the President of the Provincial Council, warning him, "Pray be careful of thy carriage to one Gray a Rom. Cath. gent. that comes over now . . . be sure to please him in his land & for distance he must take where it is clear of other pretentions." ⁶⁰ In 1685, Penn wrote to another of his colonial officials, and urged him to "Remember me to . . . J. Gray ye R[oman] C[atholic]. Keep things well with such persons for our general credit." ⁶¹ This comment shows that there were Catholics besides Gray in Pennsylvania in 1685, and moreover, that they were proving themselves beneficial to society. Other Catholics came to Pennsylvania in the following years as well. In 1686, George W. Nixon relocated to Philadelphia from Wexford, Ireland. Peter Dubuc arrived near the end of the decade with a group of French Catholics.⁶² Catholics such as Dubuc and Gray were among Pennsylvania's wealthiest residents.⁶³ They frequently appeared in court, held public offices, and associated freely with the colony's leaders. When Dubuc died in 1693, he left property to Lieutenant Governor William Markham. Within a decade, Philadelphia's Catholic population merited regular performances of the Mass from Father Thomas Harvey, one of Governor Dongan's Catholic priests.⁶⁴ Penn also encouraged his representatives to involve Catholics in the government of the colony. In 1687, he sent a formal message to the Council through John Gray, in which Penn advised his government, "I Referr you to the Bearer for publick matters, & my family Concerns, to whom show the regards due to so great a Friend of the Province." ⁶⁵

Apparently Penn was pleased with the results of his test, as Catholics lived quite peacefully under the laws of his government. His province became a haven for Roman Catholics. Things went so well that Penn's adversaries in England once again charged him with being a Jesuit.⁶⁶

V

From his Pennsylvania experience, Penn learned an important lesson that prepared him for the new phase of his political career into which he unknowingly stepped upon returning home. He discovered at first hand that when Roman Catholics were placed under the authority of a government that treated them as equals, gave them an interest in civil obedience, and where a balance of interests prevented them from accumulating power, they posed no threat to civil government. By the time he returned to England, Penn had taken the final step. He was prepared to call for a universal toleration that included Roman Catholics.

When the Duke of York became king in 1685, Penn believed that because of his age, lack of a male heir, and his Declaration of Indulgence, James would not use the throne to re-establish the Church of Rome.⁶⁷ Additionally, Penn realized that by legislatively repealing the Test and penal laws and by passing a law of toleration, both liberty of conscience and toleration for all Christians would be forever secured for England. He sought to convince the English public of this in his tracts from 1685 to 1688.

Penn cited a number of reasons why Catholics no longer presented a threat to government. First, in numerous European countries Roman Catholics lived in harmony with Protestants, as in Pennsylvania. In "Holland and many of the Principalities of Germany," Penn reasoned, "Roman Catholics have approved themselves Loyal to their Kings, Princes and States," and therefore "toleration is not dangerous to Monarchy."⁶⁸ Besides their actual docility, Penn argued that in England, "Out of eight million people, they are not thirty thousand." By virtue of sheer numbers alone, it was assured "that Popery should not mount the chair."⁶⁹ Given "the paucity of the Papists, the number of the enemies of their communion, and their unity in that aversion," Penn asked, "What greater security can we have in the world?"⁷⁰ Lastly, Penn attributed the Catholics' inability to usurp political authority to "their intestine division" between "seculars and Regulars, Jesuits and Benedictines, etc."⁷¹ They could not possibly coordinate any political maneuvers.

Since Catholics no longer posed a political threat, Penn appealed, "why should not the Church Protestants make . . . the Papists' case their own in this point, seeing they are all fellow Christians?"⁷² Penn also wondered why Catholics should not enjoy the rights of free Englishmen. He decried the Anglican Church's Test and

penal laws as not only “un-Christian,” but also un-English.⁷³ Drawing upon his Whig theology, Penn exclaimed that such laws undermined “the Fundamental Constitution of our Government,” by depriving all dissenters of the three things that “make an Englishman: Ownership, Consent in Parliament, and Right of Juries.”⁷⁴ Catholics, he continued, “are Englishmen as well as we . . .” and “the Civil rights of Englishmen ought to be no less dear to them than to us.”⁷⁵ Therefore, an Penn explained:

when . . . Popery does return to the Civil Interest of the Kingdom they will quickly be friends. For besides that we are the easiest and best natured People in the World to be appeased, there are those charms in Liberty and Property to English Nature that no endeavors can resist or disappoint. And can we reasonably think the Romanists will be wanting in that, when they see it is their own (and perhaps their only) Interest to do so?⁷⁶

As in the 1670s, Penn continued to maintain that only a balance of interests could provide effective protection against Popish domination. He theorized that drawing Catholics into the balance would pacify their political animosities, “because Liberty to Papists by Law, is bringing them into the Legal interest of the Kingdom, and may prevent the force they may else be driven to. . . .” But by excluding them with the Test and penal laws, Penn concluded, “instead of saving ourselves from Popery, we are by these partialities provoking it everyday, and methinks foolishly for our own safety.”⁷⁷ The best government, Penn had long insisted, was “that which takes in all Interests . . . because it is least exposed to State Contingencies.” It also “secures Property to all, the first reason of Civil Government, and that which every party *for its own interest* must close with.”⁷⁸ Penn’s only change in this design over the decade was that by 1685, he realized that a balance of all interests, including Catholics, would be the most effective protection against any one sect seizing power and forcing conformity upon the rest. He now included Catholics in his old argument that toleration would create a Protestant alliance against Popery. Even though Catholics would be tolerated by repealing the oppressive acts, he argued that the Church of England would “draw into her interest all the Protestant dissenters, that are abundantly more considerable than the Papists, and that are as unwilling that Popery should be National as herself.”⁷⁹

With the points concerning Catholic complacency and civil interest, Penn argued persuasively for toleration of all Christians. His argument was a consistent extension of the ideology concerning both liberty of conscience and religious toleration that he had developed since 1668. But his major obstacle to the great goal proved unsurmountable: the Catholic King James II. The odds of Parliament legislating a toleration that embraced Papists during a Protestant reign would have been astronomical. But with a Catholic as the executive they were simply nonexistent. However, Penn believed that even with a Catholic king, the Papists posed no threat to civil government. He argued that James's Declaration of Indulgence proved his goodwill toward all Christians, and that the King's age and lack of an heir, added to the nation's overwhelming Protestant majority, prevented the re-establishment of the Catholic church."⁸⁰

Immediately following James's accession to the throne, Penn addressed his Quaker followers' indignation at "the King going with his Queen publicly to Mass in Whitehall," by guaranteeing them that "if he will give liberty to Conscientious people all will do well."⁸¹ In March, 1686, James did just that, by pardoning all those, Catholic and Protestant dissenters alike, imprisoned under the penal laws. If this failed to convince Penn that the King had no designs of restoring Catholicism as the established religion, then James's Declaration of Indulgence in spring, 1687, was proof positive. Because it called for toleration of all Christian faiths and excluded none, Penn challenged the Anglican Church: "Can the Church of England possibly invent a better security than she has by his Majesties Declaration? That first of all declares, that the King will protect and maintain her in the Free Exercise of her Religion, as by law established."⁸² Then, directly addressing "the Question . . . about the King imposing his Religion upon us," Penn observed "that he gives all Parties Liberty to muster & exercise themselves according to their own Principles, [even worse] that he knows to be so very contrary to his: An odd way of advancing Popery." Penn further argued that "since [James] offers to confirm this by Law, HE ONLY CHANGES THE SECURITY, HE DOES NOT DESTROY IT."⁸³ Once legally established, toleration would protect the nation against any religion imposing conformity, even Roman Catholicism.

Besides the King's steps toward universal toleration for Christians and "his Royal Word for this much," Penn contended that James could not install Catholicism as the national religion even if it were his design.⁸⁴ "We have his age for our

security . . .,” Penn reasoned, as “he is within seven of three score; a greater age than most of his ancestors ever attained” and all of his heirs are good Protestants.⁸⁵ Penn obviously expressed this opinion before James’s Catholic wife gave birth to a son in summer, 1688. Most Anglicans in the Tory party feared the prospect of a Catholic heir to the throne. Some tried to discredit the heir by claiming that the King was too old to father a child, and suggested that the babe had been smuggled to the royal couple in a warming pan. But although the child was James’s, Penn still believed that neither the Catholics nor the King posed a serious threat to England.

Unfortunately for Penn, James, and all their dissenting followers, the plan to pack the Parliament and legislatively institutionalize toleration failed, as the King abdicated the throne in the Glorious Revolution. Starting in 1687, James began removing Church Tories from governmental posts and replacing them with Catholics. He even placed Catholics in key military positions. The following year brought the Magdalen College incident, where James transformed the wealthiest of the Oxford colleges into a Catholic institution. Then in 1688, after the seven bishops refused publicly to read his second Declaration of Indulgence, James had them imprisoned. Public sentiment weighed heavily on the side of the bishops and was loudly voiced in the days of their infamous trial. Finally, in the summer of 1688, James announced that his Queen had produced a Catholic heir to the throne. Through all of this, combined with the campaign to pack Parliament, James alienated himself not only from the Church Tories, but also from the Whigs and dissenters whom he needed for his alliance. These actions served as evidence that James was insincere in his efforts for universal toleration, and worse, that he planned to implant Roman Catholicism as the established religion. By winter, England would have new monarchs.⁸⁶

In spite of all this, Penn defended James to the very end. He truly believed that the King was earnest in his expressed desire for a tolerant government. He beseeched his followers in a 1689 “Epistle to Quakers,” that if “I [would] have apprehended that the good days we had in [King James’s] reign were a trick to introduce evill ones, all obligations would have ceased with me, and no man have more earnestly and cheerfully engaged, after my manner, against his government then my self.”⁸⁷

Because of his role in James’s government, William and Mary suspected Penn of plotting to return James to the throne. Penn was arrested and questioned in

December, 1689, and charged with high treason in June, 1690.⁸⁸ His case never went to trial because evidence of a Jacobite plot failed to materialize. Penn wisely removed himself from politics for a few years.

As for Penn's great goal of universal toleration for Christians, it would not develop in England during his lifetime. It did, however, take hold in Pennsylvania, whose non-sectarian government of toleration became the lasting legacy of Penn's political and religious ideology. By 1689, Roman Catholics even held political office in Pennsylvania. Following the Glorious Revolution, William III temporarily took possession of Penn's colony, and dispatched an order to the Pennsylvania government "continuing all officers except Roman Catholics."⁸⁹ William also revoked Maryland's colonial charter. Maryland, along with New York, which had previously been very receptive to Catholics, both adopted strong anti-Catholic measures. Fittingly, Penn's colony became a safe haven for Catholics as hundreds migrated to Pennsylvania after 1689.⁹⁰ In a ballad composed in 1744, a New York poet compared favorably Pennsylvania's treatment of Catholics with that of his own colony:

I've Papists known, right honest men,
 Alas! What shame and pity!
 Ah! How unlike the virtus [virtuous] Penn
 To drive them from our city!⁹¹

Penn may have been many things, but he certainly was not inconsistent, contradictory, or compromising concerning Roman Catholics. Admittedly, he excluded them in the 1670s and embraced them in the 1680s, but his reasoning exemplified a steady religious and political ideology. Nor did Penn change his ground politically from 1679 to 1685; rather it shifted beneath him. As Parliament swung from Whig to Tory, and as support for toleration swayed from Council to King, Penn simply moved with it, and worked with whoever offered him hope for realizing his great goal. Penn best described himself in 1689: "That herein I shall be found to act with consistency with my Constant Principle, for I always esteemed it, to be a Glorious Work, to set Conscience Free from Church-Tyranny, and to extricate the Nation from the intolerable burden of destructive Penal Laws."⁹²

Notes

*In the course of developing, thinking about, writing, and revising this article, I became indebted to several people for encouragement, ideas, criticisms, and suggestions: Thomas E. Cogswell, Lance Banning, Daniel Blake Smith, Thomas J. Kiffmeyer, Robert Jackman, Anthony Thompson, James Beward, the referees of *Pennsylvania History*, Peggy and Doug Newman, Annette and Leon Magruder, and especially Judi Newman.

1. Thomas Babington Macaulay, *The History of England from the Accession of James II* fol. 1 (Philadelphia: E. H. Butler & Co., 1856), 387.
2. William C. Braithwaite, *The Beginnings of Quakerism* (New York: Macmillan, 1912; reprint, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955), and *The Second Period of Quakerism* (New York: Macmillan, 1915; reprint, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961); Vincent Buranelli, *The King and the Quaker: A Study of William Penn and James II* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1962); Mary Maples Dunn, *William Penn: Politics and Conscience* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967); Mary M. Dunn and Richard S. Dunn, eds., *The World of William Penn* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986); Melvin B. Endy, Jr., *William Penn and Early Quakerism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1973); Joseph E. Illick, *William Penn the Politician: His Relations with the English Government* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1965); Sidney Lucas, *The Quaker Story* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1949); Catherine Owens Peare, *William Penn: A Biography* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1957); Elbert Russell, *The History of Quakerism* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1942); Harry Emerson Wildes, *William Penn* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1974).
3. A few of the most important works are: Edwin Bronner, *William Penn's Holy Experiment* (New York: Macmillan, 1962), and "Failure of the Holy Experiment in Pennsylvania," *Pennsylvania History* 21 (April 1954): 93-108; Joseph E. Illick, *Colonial Pennsylvania: A History* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1976), and "The Pennsylvania Grant: A Re-evaluation," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 86 (October 1962): 375-396, (hereafter *PMHB*); Rufus M. Jones, *The Quakers in the American Colonies* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1911); Gary B. Nash, *Quakers and Politics: Pennsylvania 1681-1726* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968), and "The Quest for the Susquehanna Valley: New York, Pennsylvania, and the Seventeenth-Century Fur Trade," *New York History* 48 (January 1967): 3-27; Sally Schwartz, *"A Mixed Multitude": The Struggle for Toleration in Colonial Pennsylvania* (New York: New York University Press, 1987); Paul Wallace, *Pennsylvania: Seed of a Nation* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1962).
4. On English anti-Catholicism and the fear of the Catholic Church's supposed designs for "Universal Monarchy," see John Miller, *Popery and Politics in England, 1660-1688* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973).
5. R. Clifton, "The Popular Fear of Catholics during the English Revolution," *Past & Present* 52 (1971): 23-25; Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas During the English Revolution* (London: Penguin Books, 1972), 231-268; Miller, *Popery and Politics*, chapter 4; Barry Reay, *The Quakers and the English Revolution* (London: Temple Smith, 1985), 64-78.
6. William Penn, *Truth Exalted; in A short but sure, Testimony against all those Religions, Faiths, and Worshipps that have been formed and followed in the darkness of Apostasy* (London, 1668), 6.
7. Many contemporary commentators noted the crucial role Penn played in Stuart age politics: Gilbert Burnet, *Bishop Burnet's History of His Own Time*, 2 vols. (London: William Smith, printer, 1840), 2:466-467; Galbraith M. Crump, ed., *Poems on the Affairs of State: Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660-1714*, 4 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968), "All Shams," 4:277-279, "The Advice," 291-294, "The Orange," 305-308, "The Scamperers," 327-330.
8. My account of the relationship derives from Burnet, *Bishop Burnet's History*; and J. R. Jones, *The Revolution of 1688 in England* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1972).

9. Mary Maples Dunn and Richard S. Dunn, eds., *The Papers of William Penn*, 4 vols. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981-1987), 3:26. Hereafter *PWP*.
10. Buranelli, *The King and the Quaker*, 56; Dunn, *William Penn: Politics and Conscience*, 108, 110-111; Illick, *William III* (London: Oxford University Press, 1955); Peare, 288-9; Stephen Saunders Webb, "The Peaceable Kingdom: Quaker Pennsylvania in the Stuart Empire," in *The World of William Penn*, 174; Wildes, *William Penn*, 215.
11. In the most recent account of his philosophy, Sally Schwartz writes that "Penn's thoughts about Roman Catholicism were inconsistent if not confused"; Schwartz, *A Mixed Multitude*, 19.
12. "Memoirs of the Life of William Penn," *The Friends Library*, 14 vols. (Philadelphia: Joseph Rakestraw, printer, 1837), 5:324-328, 191, emphasis in the original.
13. "Two Speeches To A Committee of Parliament," 22 March 1678, in *PWP* 1:533-536.
14. Hugh Ross Williamson, *The Gun Powder Plot* (London: Faber and Faber, 1951).
15. William Penn, *England's Present Interest Discovered* (London, 1675), 18.
16. William Penn, *A Brief Examination and State of Liberty Spiritual Both With Respect to persons in their Private Capacity, and in their Church Society and Communion* (London, 1681), 10.
17. William Penn, *Christian Liberty As it was Soberly Desired in a Letter to Certain Foreign States Upon Occasion of their Late Severity to several of their Inhabitants, merely for their Different Persuasion and Practice in Point of Faith and Worship Towards God* (London, 1674), 4; and *The Great Case of Liberty of Conscience Once More Briefly Debated and Defended* (Newgate, 1671), 13, 20.
18. Penn, *Great Case of Liberty of Conscience*, 20.
19. *Ibid.*, 12, 21.
20. William Penn, *Great Question to be Considered by the King, and this Approaching Parliament* (London, 1679), 4.
21. Penn, *Great Case of Liberty of Conscience*, 15.
22. "Penn's First Speech to Parliament," *PWP*, March 22, 1678, 1:533-536.
23. William Penn, *Seasonable Caveat Against Popery* (London, 1670), 4.
24. Penn, *Great Case of Liberty of Conscience*, 21, 4, emphasis added.
25. Penn, *England's Present Interest Discovered*, 23-28.
26. Penn, *Great Case of Liberty of Conscience*, 21, 4.
27. Penn, *Truth Exalted*, 5-6.
28. "Penn's First Speech to Parliament," *PWP*, March 22, 1678, 1:533-536. Political poets, too, labeled him "Father Penn" and "the disturber o' th' nation," as related in Crump, *Poems on the Affairs of State*, "The Advice," 4:292; and "All Shams," 4:278.
29. Penn, *Truth Exalted*, 5-6.
30. Penn, *A Seasonable Caveat Against Popery*, 31-32.
31. Penn, *England's Present Interest Discovered*, 28.
32. "Two Toleration Bills," March 1678, *PWP*, 1:537-542.
33. J. P. Kenyon, *The Popish Plot* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972).
34. J. R. Jones, *Revolution of 1688*; and *The First Whigs: The Politics of the Exclusion Crisis, 1673-1683* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961).
35. William Penn to Algernon Sidney, March 1, 1679, *PWP*, 1:546-549; Penn to Pieter Hendricks and Jan Claus, November 27, 1679, Penn Papers, Historical Society of Pennsylvania (hereafter cited as HSP).
36. William Penn, *One Project for the Good of England That is, Our Civil Union is our Civil Safety* (London, 1679), 4.
37. William Penn, *England's Great Interest in the Choice of this New Parliament, Dedicated to all her Freeholders and Electors* (London, 1679), 1, 4, 2.
38. William Penn, *Good Advice to the Church of England, Roman Catholic, and Protestant-Dissenter* (London, 1679); *Some Sober and Weighty Reasons against Prosecuting Protestant-Dissenters, for Difference of Opinion in Matters of Religion* (London, 1682); *Great Case of Liberty of Conscience; Great Question; England's Great Interest*.
39. Penn, *One Project for the Good of England*, 10.

40. Penn, *Great Question*, 1.
41. *Ibid.*, 5-6, emphasis added.
42. June 1, 1680, *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and the West Indies*, 10:1373; October 16, 1680, 10: 1544. Hereafter *CSPC*.
43. William Penn, *The Oath of Irish Papists No Evidence Against Protestants: or a Warning of Piece to Jurors* (London, August 1, 1681); *The Protestants' Remonstrance Against Pope and Presbyter: An Impartial Essay Upon the Times or Plea for Moderation* (London, 1681); *Some Sober and Weighty Reasons: A Brief Examination*.
44. Penn, *Protestants' Remonstrance*, 10.
45. Penn, *Some Sober and Weighty Reasons*, 2.
46. Dunn, *William Penn: Politics and Conscience*, 131; Illick, "The Pennsylvania Grant: A Re-evaluation"; and Webb, "'The Peaceable Kingdom,'" 173-4.
47. Dunn, *William Penn: Politics and Conscience*, 131.
48. *CPSC*, August 18, 1685, 12:320; August 18, 1685, 12:321; March 1687, 12:1160.
49. Lords Committee for Trade and Plantations to William Penn, October 20, 1688, "Memoirs of the Life of William Penn," *The Friends Library*, 5:200-202.
50. Burnet, *Bishop Burnet's History*, 466-467.
51. Manuscripts of Stanley Leighton, Esq., M.P., *Historical Manuscripts Commission*, ser. 13 (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1885), 376; William Penn to Richard Jobson[?], January 19, 1688, *PWP*, 3:175-177.
52. Jones, *Revolution of 1688*, 129-134.
53. Kenyon, *The Popish Plot*; Miller, *Popery and Politics*.
54. "The Frame of Government of the Province of Pennsylvania," 1682, *PWP*, 2:224-5.
55. See especially: Thomas Dongan to William Penn, May 1, 1683, Gratz Collection, Colonial Governors, Case 2, Box 29, HSP; Lord Baltimore to Penn, May 23, 1683, Penn Papers, Official Correspondence, vol. 1, p. 3, HSP; Baltimore to Penn, June 24, 1683, Penn Papers, Official Correspondence, vol. 1, p. 5, HSP; Penn to Baltimore, July 30, 1683, Penn Papers, Additional and Miscellaneous Letters, vol. 1, p. 3, HSP; Penn to Baltimore, August 22, 1683, Pennsylvania Miscellaneous, p. 10, HSP; Dongan to Penn, October 10, 1683, and October 22, 1683, Society Collection, HSP; Penn to Baltimore, October 31, 1683, Penn Manuscripts, Boundaries, vol. 11, HSP; Dongan to Penn, December 12, 1683, Society Collection, HSP; Dongan to Penn, February 19, 1684, Dreer Collection, American Governors, HSP; Dongan to Penn, March 17, 1684, Society Collection, HSP; Penn to Dongan, June 10, 1684, Dreer Collection, p. 50, HSP; Dongan to Penn, 1684, Cadwalader Collection, Box 3, Delaware Folder, HSP.
56. William Penn to Lord Baltimore, March 12, 1683, in *Microfilm of the Papers of William Penn* (Philadelphia: Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1975), 4:1217, microfilm. Hereafter *MPWP*.
57. William Penn to John Alloway, November 29, 1683, *MPWP*, 4:2102.
58. William Penn to Richard Butler, January 9, 1684, *MPWP*, 4:1690.
59. Henry H. Bisbee, "John Tatham, Alias Gray," *PMHB* 83 (July 1959): 253-264; "The First Purchasers of Pennsylvania," *PWP*, 2:644.
60. William Penn to Thomas Lloyd, March 16, 1685, Cadwalader Collection, Box 2, Fol. 2, HSP.
61. William Penn to James Harrison, December 4, 1685, Penn Papers, Domestic and Miscellaneous Letters, p. 22, HSP.
62. Joseph L. J. Kirlin, *Catholicity in Philadelphia: From the Earliest Missionaries Down to the Present Time* (Philadelphia: John McVey, printer, 1909), 15-16.
63. *Ibid.*; Bisbee, "John Tatham, Alias Gray," 254; Lois V. Given, "'The Great and Stately Palace': Inventories of the Estate of John and Elizabeth Tatham," *PMHB* 87 (July 1959): 265-270.
64. Kirlin, *Catholicity in Philadelphia*, 16.
65. William Penn to the Commissioners of State, December 21, 1687, *PWP*, 3:168-9.
66. Joseph J. Casino, "Anti-Popery in Colonial Pennsylvania," *PMHB* 105 (July 1981): 288;

George Hutcheson to Penn, February 17, 1683, Penn Papers, Box 9, HSP.

67. William Penn, *A Letter From a Gentleman in the Country, To his Friends in London, Upon the Subject of the Penal Laws and Tests* (London, 1687), 8; *A Second Letter from a Gentleman in the Country, To his Friends in London, Upon the Subject of the Penal Laws and Tests* (London, 1687), 6; *Advice to Freeholders and other Electors of Members to Serve in Parliament in Relation to the Penal Laws and Tests* (London, 1687), 5; *Good Advice to the Church of England*, 50.

68. William Penn, *A Perswasive to Moderation to Dissenting Christians, in Prudence and Conscience Humbly submitted to the King and His Great Council* (Shoreditch, 1685), 19, 15. Penn spent thirteen pages making this point with more than a dozen examples. *Good Advice to the Church of England*, 42.

69. William Penn, *Good Advice to the Church of England*, 49; *A Letter From a Gentleman in the Country*, 6.

70. Penn, *A Letter From a Gentleman in the Country*, 8.

71. Penn, *Good Advice to the Church of England*, 49, 51.

72. William Penn, *Considerations Moving to a Toleration and Liberty of Conscience with Arguments Inducing to a Cessation of the Penal Statutes against all Dissenters Whatever, upon the Account of Religion, Occasioned by an Excellent Discourse upon that Subject, Published by his Grace, The Duke of Buckingham, Humbly offered to the Parliament at their next sitting at Westminster* (London, 1685), 2.

73. Penn, *Good Advice to the Church of England*, 2.

74. William Penn, *Three Letters Tending to demonstrate how the Security of this Nation Against all Future Persecution for Religion, Lies in the Abolishment of the Present Penal Laws and Tests, and in the Establishment of a NEW LAW for UNIVERSAL LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE* (London, 1688), 13; *A Second Letter From a Gentleman in the Country*, 18.

75. Penn, *A Second Letter*, 18.

76. Penn, *Good Advice to the Church of England*, 47-48.

77. Penn, *A Letter From a Gentleman in the Country*, 9, 4.

78. Penn, *A Second Letter*, 18.

79. Penn, *Good Advice to the Church of England*, 44.

80. Penn, *Advice to Freeholders*, 5; *A Second Letter*, 10; *Good Advice to the Church of England*, 12, 50; *A Letter From a Gentleman in the Country*, 8.

81. Penn to Thomas Lloyd, March 16, 1685, Cadwalader Collection, Box 2, Fol. 2, HSP.

82. Penn, *Advice to Freeholders*, 5.

83. Penn, *A Second Letter*, 10.

84. Penn, *Considerations Moving Toward a Toleration*, 6.

85. Penn, *Good Advice to the Church of England*, 50.

86. Good interpretations of the Glorious Revolution are: Jones, *Revolution of 1688*; J. P. Kenyon, *Revolution Principles: The Politics of Party, 1689-1720* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977); Ogg, *England in the Reigns of James II and William III*.

87. William Penn, "Epistle to Quakers," Autumn, 1689, PWP, 3:267-271.

88. July 14, 1690, *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, William & Mary, 1690-1691*, 2:65.

89. Charles P. Keith, *Chronicles of Pennsylvania From the English Revolution to the Peace of Aux-La-Chapelle, 1688-1748*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: Patterson & White, 1917), 1:199.

90. Jacob Leisler to Bishop Salisbury, January 7, 1690, CSPC, 10:690; John R. Brodhead, ed., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York* (Albany: Weed, Parsons & Co., 1853), 3:585-586, 609, 617, 689; Casino, "Anti-Popery in Colonial Pennsylvania," 289.

91. "A Poor Man's Advice to His Neighbor. A Ballad. New York, 1744," in Martin I. J. Griffin, "William Penn, the Friend of the Catholics," *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society*, 1 (1884-1886): 71-75.

92. Penn, *Advice to Freeholders*, 1.