

THEOLOGICAL SOURCES OF WILLIAM PENN'S  
CONCEPT OF RELIGIOUS TOLERATION\*

Kenneth R. Morris  
Colorado, USA

ABSTRACT

William Penn left no direct testimony to the sources of his intellectual and theological development. Through an investigation of the possible influences on Penn up to when he wrote the majority of his works on religious toleration, however, it is possible to argue that the major influences often credited in Penn's development—contemporary European philosophy and two years of study at Oxford—are much less plausible than his two years at the Saumur Academy in France under the instruction of Moses Amyraut.

KEYWORDS

William Penn, Moses Amyraut, John Cameron, Saumur, religious toleration, Calvinism.

Central to the popular image of William Penn are his roles as the founding father of Pennsylvania and the paradigmatic American Quaker. No doubt for many people the first thing that comes to mind when the name of William Penn is mentioned is the picture on the box of Quaker Oatmeal or the Penn State motor oil can!<sup>1</sup> The narrowness of these popular conceptions obscures one of Penn's most important contributions in the course of the political, ideological, and theological struggles of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries: specifically, the concept of religious toleration.

William Penn's adult life spanned the years of religious and political turmoil which included the Puritan Commonwealth, the rise of the Independents, the restoration of Charles II (1660), the Act of Uniformity (1662), the succession of Catholic-leaning James II (1685–88), William and Mary and the Glorious Revolution (1688), The Act of Toleration (1689), Queen Anne, and George I. This shifting political situation, together with the social status of his family and his own

faith development, placed Penn in a unique position out of which his ideas on politics, religion, and human rights had a substantial impact on his contemporaries and successors. This impact was perhaps nowhere more significant than in its contribution to the shape of the United States Constitution.<sup>2</sup>

In the wake of the celebrations commemorating the bicentennial of the 1787 Constitutional Convention, it has often been noted that the historical rendering of the Founding Fathers as strong evangelical Christians is a popular fiction.<sup>3</sup> Scholars like to point out that the main influence on the Founding Fathers was more the European Enlightenment thinking of John Locke and others, than heart-felt evangelical concepts. In contrast to such assertions, it must be pointed out that the influence of the ideas of William Penn was certainly an important vehicle by which Christianity made an impact in the framing of the federal Constitution. Many British and Continental philosophers had proposed theoretical guidelines for the ideal democratic government in the seventeenth century, but only Penn had the opportunity and the responsibility actually to apply a working democratic constitution in the colonies.

While considering Penn's 1681 'Frame of Government' for the Pennsylvania colony, Thomas Jefferson made the quite generous assessment that Penn was 'the first, either in ancient or modern times, who has laid the foundation of government in the pure and unadulterated principles of peace, of reason and right'.<sup>4</sup> A more recent evaluation of Penn's influence on American constitutional history was offered by William W. Comfort, former president of Haverford College:

Morally, Penn was as much a Puritan as the founders of the oldest New England Colonies. Like them, he based his policy on Christianity as a revealed religion. Penn's religion, however, was not bound with bands of iron, but was expansive and inclusive of other faiths. Thus, the founding Fathers of the Republic with their 'natural religion' of the Age of the Enlightenment found nothing in Penn which they could not adopt.<sup>5</sup>

Notwithstanding Comfort's bias and enthusiastic hyperbole, these comments are helpful because they draw attention to the connection between Penn's theological perspective and his political philosophy. In light of Penn's influence on the framers of the U.S. Constitution,<sup>6</sup> the shape of this connection is a matter of considerable historical importance.

This essay seeks to understand this connection more deeply by focusing on one particular question: What was the basis of William Penn's conception of religious liberty? The thesis to be argued is that Penn was shaped decisively in this area during his time of study at the Huguenot Academy in the town of Saumur, France. After his expulsion from Oxford in March 1662, Penn spent two years (1662–64) studying at Saumur under the Calvinist theologian Moses Amyraut (1596–1664). It was Penn's exposure to Amyraut's moderate form of Calvinism, as well as the general theological atmosphere of Saumur, which was of decisive influence in the formation of Penn's ideas about religious liberty.

## INFLUENCES ON WILLIAM PENN BEFORE AND AFTER SAUMUR

While William Jr was growing up, the Penn family lived for six years at Wanstead, near London, where he learned the Latin classics at Chigwell School in Essex, and for four years at County Oak, Ireland, where he had private tutors. Little is known about life in the Penn family during this period. The information is chiefly anecdotal, an interesting source being a 1729 manuscript purporting to be the work of a Thomas Harvey who, in 1700, wrote down the story of Penn's spiritual progress to Quaker beliefs, supposedly told to him by William Jr himself.<sup>7</sup>

The year 1660 was a landmark year for the Penn family: Parliament restored the Monarchy, William Sr was knighted, and William Jr turned sixteen and enrolled at Christ Church, Oxford. William Jr's time of study at Oxford, from October 1660 until his expulsion in March 1662, is given a large share of attention by his biographers, each attempting to invest some new and greater significance in this period for Penn's intellectual development. There can be no doubt that it was an important transition for the young man, but perhaps no more than for the scores of other boys who studied at Oxford at the time. In order to make a fair judgment as to the significance of this period for Penn's development, it is helpful to examine individually the three aspects that are highlighted by biographers: his supposed friendship with John Locke, his relationship with the Independent John Owen, and the general content of his instruction.

In the first place, it is often said that at Oxford Penn met and was befriended by John Locke, who at the time was studying medicine as a Don at Christ Church.<sup>8</sup> Although it is possible that the two met, it is highly unlikely that they became 'intimate friends', as some biographers like to imply.<sup>9</sup> Locke was twelve years Penn's senior and would have had little reason to socialize with the young 'scholar'. Such a connection between Penn and Locke at this early point is most likely wishful thinking based on a backward extrapolation from the fact that the two men developed a relationship in later years.

Even in light of their later relationship, the question of who was more influential on whom is difficult to resolve conclusively. Records indicate that both Penn's and Locke's personal libraries contained a good portion of the work of the other,<sup>10</sup> yet there is no extant correspondence between the two that might give insight into their relationship. The archives of the Pennsylvania Historical Society have a handwritten draft of the introduction to Penn's 1681 'Frame of Government' on which Locke and Algernon Sidney wrote their comments in the margins. However, far from being evidence that Penn's thinking was primarily shaped by Locke, such a document suggests that it was Penn who influenced Locke's political philosophy.<sup>11</sup> Although Locke began to write on freedom of conscience as early as 1667, his famous *Essay concerning Toleration* was not penned until 1685. At a time when Locke had only begun to re-examine his Hobbesian political views, Penn was already hard at work developing a legal defence for himself and his fellow Quakers who were under constant threat of imprisonment for conscience sake.<sup>12</sup>

In 1669 Locke helped draft a revision of the Constitution of the Carolinas colony for Anthony Ashley Cooper, one of the colony's nine proprietors. Ashley and his partners had wanted to attract more settlers to their proprietorship and they realized that a constitution offering a greater balance between their proprietary interests and popular participation would be a significant enticement.<sup>13</sup> In spite of such intentions, Locke's revision was hardly a step beyond a feudal structure of government. It is in no way comparable with his later, more democratic, *Second Treatise of Government* (1688).<sup>14</sup> Locke's *First Treatise on Government* (1680), published in the year before Penn wrote his Pennsylvania 'Frame of Government', was an attack on Hobbes's prescription for an all-powerful state, but it still fell far short of what Penn was proposing at the time.<sup>15</sup> Later in life, Locke would declare that Penn's constitution was superior to his own attempt for the Carolinas Colony,<sup>16</sup> yet in spite of these indications, scholars are more often tempted to credit Locke with shaping Penn's political thought, rather than the reverse, or even a mutual development.<sup>17</sup>

A second importance given Penn's time at Oxford is in regard to his relationship with the Independent divine John Owen.<sup>18</sup> Owen had been Cromwell's chaplain during the Irish and Scotch campaigns and in 1651 Cromwell appointed him Dean of Christ Church, then Vice-Chancellor of the University. In 1660, the year William Jr entered Christ Church, Restorationism at Oxford had triggered a general housecleaning of Independents on the Oxford campuses. Owen was one of many removed from their posts. Owen's replacement at Christ Church reintroduced High Church rituals in the chapel services. All the while Owen continued to lecture and hold worship services on the outskirts of town, encouraging the students who attended these functions to resist the changes being made.

Apparently, William Jr fell in with a group of students who objected to the High Church atmosphere that the Restoration had brought to Oxford. This group sat in on Owen's lectures and attended his worship services in lieu of the Christ Church chapel. Initially Penn was fined for failing to attend official worship. Ultimately he was suspended from the college, but the exact reason for his suspension was not recorded. Whether he was kicked out for a continued absence from chapel services, or, as some biographers speculate, for involvement with a group of students who were tearing the surplices off the heads of their fellow students,<sup>19</sup> the one thing that is clear about Penn's suspension is that it was in response to his dissenting views.

Just because Penn was attracted to dissenting worship does not, however, lead to the conclusion that he was influenced by Owen toward religious toleration in general. Owen himself was generally critical of any doctrine that did not meet the test of his orthodoxy, and he was particularly critical of Quakerism.<sup>20</sup> Brailsford cites testimonies that in 1654 two Quaker men were arrested following Owen's complaint for preaching in the streets of Oxford, and in the same year two Quaker women, passing through town on a missionary trip, were so badly treated that one of them felt called by God to strip to the waist and walk the street

proclaiming God's imminent judgment.<sup>21</sup> Penn would later criticise Owen for his double-standard with regard to Quaker persecution: 'Have Whitaker, Reynolds, Laud, Owen, Baxter, Stillingfleet, Poole, &c. disarmed the Romanists of these inhuman weapons [of imposed conformity], that you might employ them against your inoffensive countrymen?'<sup>22</sup>

Looking back on his time at Christ Church, Penn had very few good memories. In addition to reacting against the Restorationist tone, he had been repelled by student life in general.<sup>23</sup> The one positive thing Penn was able to identify about his Oxford years was that they were the starting point for his search which culminated in his 'convincement' of the truth of Quakerism.<sup>24</sup> Whether Penn was able to hear Thomas Loe preach again during this time, as some suggest, is unsubstantiated.<sup>25</sup> Had such an opportunity occurred, it seems very unlikely that he would fail to mention having heard Loe, the person whose preaching would spark his conversion six years later.

A third aspect of possible influence on Penn during the Oxford years is the formal instruction he received. It is difficult to say with any accuracy what would have been the content of the curriculum at Christ Church; even more so to say to what extent Penn's ideas about religious toleration were shaped by his classes. At best, it is possible to speculate what books he would have read and what kind of ideas he could have been exposed to. An inventory of the Christ Church library holdings c. 1665 lists over 2000 volumes.<sup>26</sup> Most of these were theological works, but also included were works by authors such as Descartes, Hugo Grotius, and Thomas Hobbes.

When Penn entered Christ Church, the political philosophy of Hobbes (1588–1679) dominated the intellectual scene, so there can be little doubt that Penn read Hobbes's capstone work published in 1651, *Leviathan, of the Matter, Form and Power of a Commonwealth, Ecclesiastical and Civil*.<sup>27</sup> Hobbes spent much of his scholarly career reflecting on the political turmoil of England in the seventeenth century. Writing in light of the English Civil War and the execution of Charles I but before the Restoration, he had come to the radical conclusion that there must be a complete separation of philosophy and theology. Corollary to this, Hobbes also argued that the church must be subordinate to the state if the state (the Leviathan) was to keep the civil peace effectively. Hobbes's political philosophy gave the state the authority to regulate all aspects of religion. Assuming the sovereign was a Christian, Hobbes believed there would be no essential conflict between church and state because he understood the only Christian non-negotiable to be the belief that 'Jesus is the Christ, the son of the Living God'. Certainly a Christian sovereign would not begrudge his subjects a belief in this tenet, especially when all other religious questions fell to the state to decide.<sup>28</sup> This was certainly not a prescription for religious toleration.<sup>29</sup>

Even more important than an exposure to the political philosophy of Thomas Hobbes was Penn's exposure to the humanistic ideas of Hugo Grotius (1583–1645), if in fact such an exposure took place at Oxford.<sup>30</sup> It is certain that by 1669 Penn had had the opportunity to read Grotius's work. In that year, following his conversion to Quakerism, Penn wrote of Grotius that he was one 'than whom,

these latter Ages think they have not had a man of more profound Policy and universal Learning; as well as in his Commentaries on the Bible, as various other Labours'.<sup>31</sup> Penn obviously had been impressed by Grotius's ideas. What is unclear is whether or not this impression was formed at Oxford. It is just as conceivable that this exposure came later on, at Saumur, particularly in light of the humanist orientation which characterized the Saumur Academy.<sup>32</sup>

Before turning to examine Penn's time at Saumur, it is necessary to look for other significant intellectual influences in the period between Saumur and Penn's conversion. In early 1664 Penn left Saumur and travelled to Paris and Italy with Robert Spencer, one of his classmates from Oxford and a future Earl of Sunderland. It was on this journey that scholars speculate Penn met the well-known Puritan republican Algernon Sidney, who was in exile on the Continent due to his role on the commission that tried and executed Charles I.

Similar to the speculations about Penn's relationship with Locke, historians are prone to use Penn's later acquaintance with Sidney as justification for dating an initial meeting between the two men as early as possible. It has been suggested that Penn met Sidney in Italy,<sup>33</sup> but a more likely scenario, owing to the fact that Sidney was in Holland in 1664, is that the two met at the house of Benjamin Furly, a wealthy, English expatriate in Rotterdam.<sup>34</sup> Furly was one of the earliest and most zealous of George Fox's converts to Quakerism. He was also a friend and patient of John Locke, and at least one of Penn's biographers tries to play up Furly's connection to both Sidney and Locke as the supporting evidence for a meeting between Penn and Sidney in 1664.<sup>35</sup> Such a connection relies, however, on a pre-existing close relationship between Locke and Penn, which has already been brought into doubt. The hypothesis that Penn was introduced to Sidney on his way home through Rotterdam remains, in the final analysis, unsubstantiated.

The first known meeting between Penn and Benjamin Furly took place in 1671, after Penn was already a Quaker and was travelling through Holland and Germany in order to make connections with Christians sympathetic to the Quaker style of faith. Furly came along with Penn on this trip to act as translator for their small missionary company. The first known meeting between Penn and Algernon Sidney took place in England eight years later, after Sidney had returned from exile and Penn had returned from his second trip with Furly through Germany and Holland. In that year Penn and Sidney teamed up to campaign for a parliamentary seat for Sidney.

Rather than insisting that their friendship began with an unsubstantiated meeting at a time when a young Penn was still sorting through what he believed, it seems a much more reasonable scenario that Furly had recommended Sidney's acquaintance to Penn during their travels together. Furly would likely have told Penn all about Sidney's politics and character, just as he would have had ample opportunity to tell Sidney (and also John Locke) all about the bright young Quaker named William Penn. When the opportunity came for Penn and Sidney to meet and work together the two would have been eager to do so. If Penn's connections with Sidney and Locke were made through Furly, and Penn's connection with

Furly was due to his conversion to Quakerism, then there is no need to stretch the coincidences of history to accommodate the earliest possible meetings between these three men. It is not necessary to date Penn's first meetings with Locke and Sidney at Oxford in 1660 and Rotterdam in 1664, respectively. If these early dates are ruled out, then any significant influence that Sidney and Locke may have had on Penn's thinking would have been after the mid-1670s.<sup>36</sup>

Another possible influence on Penn's intellectual growth was his short period of legal studies at Lincoln's Inn. After a short resumption of his Grand Tour in 1664, Penn returned to London and enrolled at Lincoln's Inn. When he began his studies in February 1665, there were only eight days remaining in the first term. Almost immediately after the start of the second term William Sr took his son out of school to accompany him on his successful naval campaign against the Dutch. Penn missed all but two weeks of the second term while he was with his father. Only five days into the third term the Plague broke out in London and Lincoln's Inn shut down. Penn ended up never completing a single academic term, although he was able to make use of the law library to read up on British common law during the two-month winter recess.<sup>37</sup> Under the circumstances, Penn's time at Lincoln's Inn can hardly be considered a productive period of study.

Penn remained in London from June 1665, when Lincoln's Inn was closed, until January 1666, when he left for Ireland to manage the affairs at his father's new estate. Within a year he had heard Quaker evangelist Thomas Loe preach again and the effect was decisive. It was at this time that he began associating with the Quakers in his area. No official roles were kept of early Quaker membership, so historians date Penn's conversion to September 1667—the month in which he was first arrested with other Quakers.

#### WILLIAM PENN AND THE SAUMUR ACADEMY

While William Jr was away at Oxford, William Sr worried about his son's attraction to the Independent cause. Samuel Pepys, the well-known seventeenth-century diarist through whom much juicy, high society gossip has been preserved, recorded that William Sr had made inquiries of his friends whether Cambridge would be a better atmosphere for his son.<sup>38</sup> William Sr was particularly upset when, after William Jr had been expelled from Oxford, he was shown a letter from John Owen to his son.<sup>39</sup> In order to counteract the bad tendencies that he felt were developing in his son, William Sr sent him abroad for a Grand Tour of the Continent. After a short stay in Paris, Penn found his way to the Saumur Academy in the Loire Valley, where he remained for almost two years of study under the Calvinist theologian Moses Amyraut. In order to evaluate the variety of scholarly opinions on the impact on Penn of Saumur in general and Amyraut in particular, it is important first to place Saumur and Amyraut in their broader historical, political, and theological contexts.

Similar to the rest of Europe, France in the sixteenth century had experienced an ongoing struggle in the realignment of political power. The combination of the needs of the French nobility, which sought to preserve its interests when

confronted by foreign influence on the crown, and the growing humanism of the period led to an inexorable shift in political theory from 'the right to resist to the duty to resist'.<sup>40</sup> Such developments in political theory were foundational for the French Calvinists' growing willingness to perceive the good of the French State apart from the good of the king. This was particularly the case during the French Wars of Religion (1550s–1580s). After the Bartholomew's Day Massacres of August 1572, French Protestant theorizing on civil resistance and popular sovereignty redoubled.<sup>41</sup>

The pamphlet *Vindiciae contra Tyrannos* (1579) by Huguenot Philippe Duplessis-Mornay (1549–1623) is representative of such developments.<sup>42</sup> In this work the author grappled with the question of whether Christians are obligated to obey a sovereign who orders them to disobey God's law. For Duplessis-Mornay, it was obvious that there was no such obligation, but what was more difficult to determine was whether such a sovereign might be actively resisted, and if so, in what manner. In order to clarify the believer's duties in such a situation, Duplessis-Mornay argued from a covenantal understanding of the relationship between God, king, magistrates, and the people. The king's covenant with God was to govern justly in God's name. The magistrates' covenantal responsibilities were to hold the king accountable to a just rule and to resist all unjust use of royal power. Since the people could not be expected to know what just rule consisted of, the magistrates were also responsible for representing the people's best interests. In Duplessis-Mornay's political theory the king's divine appointment remained unchallenged, but there was the characteristically humanistic shift which placed a new emphasis on the exercise of political power for the good of the people.

In response to the growing external threat of the Italians and the Spanish, the French Wars of Religion began to wind down in the 1580s. Protestants were afforded a greater degree of toleration, culminating in the Edict of Nantes in 1598. Along with this greater toleration came a greater French Protestant support for a strong sovereign ruler, so long as that ruler was willing to uphold religious toleration. Such was the situation which prevailed following 1600, the year that Duplessis-Mornay founded the Protestant Academy at Saumur.

After the religious articles of the Edict of Nantes were reaffirmed by the Peace of Alés in 1629, the Saumur Academy grew and prospered. It came to be known for its moderate Calvinism which sought a balance between Arminianism and a strict Dortian emphasis on predestination. This *via media* took on its best-known form in the theology of Moses Amyraut.<sup>43</sup>

In light of Saumur's reputation for moderate Calvinism, it is ironic that one of the early chairs of theology was held by Franz Gomarus (1563–1641), best known for his opposition to Jakobus Arminius at the University of Leiden and later at the Synod of Dort (1618). After failing in his attempt to have Arminius and his followers removed from the faculty at Leiden, Gomarus resigned his teaching position in 1611 and eventually ended up at Saumur in 1614. Gomarus taught at Saumur until 1618, at which time he returned to Holland to teach at Groningen and to renew his doctrinal battle against the Arminians—this time with more success.<sup>44</sup>



It appears that Gomarus's hard-line predestinarian emphasis provoked a reaction at Saumur, because his replacement could not have held a more contrary position.<sup>45</sup> In 1618, the Scotsman John Cameron (1579–1623)<sup>46</sup> was appointed as Gomarus's successor in the chair of theology at Saumur. Cameron was a moderate Calvinist whose teaching stressed both God's grace and human free will. In order to allow for a strong sense of both of these doctrines, Cameron proposed that God determined the human will only indirectly, through an infusion of knowledge on the mind. This meant that God did not move the will physically, but only morally. God infused knowledge into the mind, and then the will was determined by the practical judgment of the mind.

This stress on the mind's ability to direct the will, together with Cameron's belief in the universal potential of Christ's atonement, led champions of the Synod of Dort to label Cameron and his followers 'Pelagian' and 'Universalist'. Yet in spite of these accusations, Cameron's theology was never condemned. The theologians at Saumur were in a unique position: had the national synod of the French Reformed Church declared them heretical, the Academy would have had to close down, since the Edict of Nantes did not protect unrecognized Protestant institutions.<sup>47</sup> When faced with the choice between losing a Protestant stronghold or living with a non-Dortian Calvinism, the national synod chose the latter, regardless of what the churches in Holland and Geneva said. John Cameron taught at Saumur for only three years, but during that period he made a lasting impact. Cameron's moderate Calvinism was enthusiastically adopted not only by his best-known student, Moses Amyraut, but also by his other well-known protégées, Louis Cappel and Josué de la Place, both of whom returned to Saumur to teach.

Josué de la Place (1604–1665) was best known for his controversial stand on the doctrine of original sin.<sup>48</sup> In 1640 De la Place published a book in which he made a distinction between immediate and mediate imputation of original sin. De la Place explained that immediate imputation of sin is the idea that Adam's first act of transgression was imputed to Adam's posterity prior to a hereditary corruption. In contrast, mediate imputation is the hereditary transmission of a corrupt nature. In other words, immediate imputation is the cause of our inward, habitual corruption; mediate imputation is the effect of this corruption.

De la Place rejected immediate imputation on the grounds that it would be unjust to impute the sin of Adam to all people, since Adam was the one who committed the transgression. De la Place therefore concluded that only the consequences of Adam's sin are imputed to Adam's posterity. Furthermore, he argued that God, in condemning sinful humanity, punishes only the hereditary consequences of Adam's sin and not the original act of transgression itself.<sup>49</sup>

De la Place's opponents feared that this attempt to frame the concept of original sin solely in terms of mediate imputation would jeopardize the entire doctrine. They anticipated that an understanding of human sinfulness which took responsibility for the effect of Adam's transgression without also owning its prior cause would be seen as unfair and illogical, and eventually be rejected altogether. While it made sense that God would impute his righteousness to sinners in whom

there was no prior righteousness, it made no sense that God would impute sinfulness where there was no antecedent guilt, which is what De la Place's view of mediate imputation implied.<sup>50</sup>

In 1644–45 the national synod at Charenton condemned De la Place's views. This was a significant setback for the Saumur theologians who supported De la Place's perspective, but not a defeat.<sup>51</sup> De la Place's ideas seem to have gone underground, not surprisingly, at the Saumur Academy. In 1659, just two years before Penn arrived at Saumur, the national synod at Loudun, presided over by Jean Daillé (1594–1670), acquitted Amyraut of heresy charges and softened the church's earlier condemnation of the theory of mediate imputation. Daillé had been Amyraut's predecessor in the pastorate at the Protestant church in Saumur. He too had been strongly influenced by Cameron's theology. It was Daillé who recommended to the Saumur church that Amyraut be brought back to Saumur as his replacement in 1626. In 1655 Daillé had written a defence of Amyraut's view of the atonement (*Apologie des Synodes d'Alençon et de Charenton*) and when Amyraut was brought before the Loudun synod on heresy charges, Daillé's influence was the key in his acquittal.

The second protégée of Cameron, Huguenot Louis Cappel (1585–1658),<sup>52</sup> studied theology at Sedan and Saumur, followed by two years of Arabic studies at Oxford. In 1613 he was appointed to the chair of Hebrew at Saumur and in 1633 he was appointed to a chair of theology. Cappel was best known for his textual-critical work on the Bible. He was one of the first biblical scholars to do a careful study of the history of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament. As a result he came to the conclusion that the disparity between various ancient manuscripts and the Masoretic text pointed to a failure of the integrity of the Hebrew text—a position that amounted to an attack on the verbal inspiration of Scripture.<sup>53</sup>

In light of Cappel's humanistic approach to Scripture, Daillé's 1631 publication entitled *A Treatise concerning the Right Use of the Fathers* took on added significance. In this work, Daillé attacked those in the church who wanted to make the early Church Fathers the deciding authority on matters of contemporary theology. He argued that the extant Patristic texts were often corrupted, and even when they were reliable, their reasoning was inconsistent.<sup>54</sup> By itself, it would seem that such a critique of the early Fathers would have had the effect of refocusing the locus of authority onto the Bible, returning the church to the original power of the Reformation doctrines.<sup>55</sup>

However, when combined with Cappel's textual criticism at Saumur, such a position generated an undercurrent of suspicion with regard to any dogmatic declaration from tradition. John Cameron had taught Daillé and Cappel to be wary of the human propensity to corrupt religious concepts. Cameron's remedy to this problem had been to measure traditional dogma against the apostolic writings of the New Testament.<sup>56</sup> In light of the textual doubts raised by Cappel, however, it is not surprising that Amyraut's approach to Scripture placed a stronger emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit in convicting the believer of truth in a way which transcended intellectual belief.<sup>57</sup> Amyraut moved the

emphasis in faith from intellectual assent to the biblical witness and onto the renewal of one's whole being accomplished by the Holy Spirit.

In 1616 Moses Amyraut happened to pass through the city of Saumur on holiday from his law studies at the University of Poitiers at Orleans. While on a visit to the Protestant minister at Saumur, Amyraut was challenged by the government of the city to apply his intellectual gifts to theology instead of the law. As the story is told, Amyraut's father was amenable to his son's proposed career change only if Moses would postpone making his decision until after reading Calvin's *Institutes*. Amyraut followed his father's advice and decided on a career in the church and the theological academy. In 1618 Amyraut enrolled at Saumur and began his studies under John Cameron, who soon came to consider him his 'greatest scholar'.<sup>58</sup>

Cameron left Saumur in 1621, but Amyraut stayed on for at least another two years. After a short appointment to a parish in the province of Maine, Amyraut returned to Saumur as the pastor of the Protestant church. In 1626 Amyraut began to lecture part-time at the Academy. In 1631, he was hired as a full professor and remained at Saumur, as both minister and professor, until his death in 1664.

Amyraut's theology was, to a large extent, a further elaboration of his teacher's moderate Calvinism. Cameron had sought to compensate for what he felt was an overemphasis on the justice of God in what had come to be considered orthodox Calvinism. To do this he emphasized the historical character of God's redemptive activity—a perspective which would have arisen quite naturally out of his humanist education at the University of Glasgow. He also emphasized God's mercy over his justice.<sup>59</sup> In order to emphasize God's grace as prior to any action by human beings, Cameron stressed a covenant theology, which began with the Covenant of Nature whereby God had placed a divine sensitivity in the heart of every person and ended up centred on the Covenant of Grace.<sup>60</sup> At root, Cameron was attempting to recover the Reformation doctrine of justification *sola gratia*, which he felt had been obscured by Reformed Scholasticism's focus on the third use of the law.<sup>61</sup> Cameron's emphasis on God's grace led him to teach a 'hypothetical' universalism which held that Christ's death was potentially effective for every person, but actually effective only for believers.

This position did not differ in essence from the decisions articulated in the Canons of Dort stressing that Christ's death was 'of infinite value and worth, abundantly sufficient to expiate the sins of the entire world'.<sup>62</sup> The difficulty that the Reformed theologians had with Cameron's theology came later in the seventeenth century, when the struggle between the Arminians and the predestinarian champions of Dort had led to more exaggerated positions on both sides and when there was less political need for Protestant unity.

At the same time that the Synod of Dort was articulating Reformed soteriology in a manner that forced Calvinists and Lutherans apart, the 30 Years War, which would call for Protestant unity against the Catholics, was just beginning. Cameron's moves to shape Reformed theology apart from a preoccupation with predestination turned out to be a productive basis for ecumenical discussion. By

the late 1620s, an alliance between Lutherans and Calvinists to defend against the Catholic advances of the first half of the war was more urgent than ever.<sup>63</sup> King Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden was pushing for unity among Protestants; the Polish Count of Lezno, a member of the Bohemian Brethren, had produced an impressive code of rights for German Lutherans in his territory; and in 1631 the Synod of Charenton, with Amyraut's prodding, decided to allow for intercommunion between Calvinists and Lutherans.

When Amyraut accepted the chair of theology at Saumur in 1631, he picked up where Cameron had left off ten years earlier. He stressed ecumenical cooperation, even across the wide Protestant–Catholic divide of the seventeenth century.<sup>64</sup> At the same time, however, he did not play the role of a compliant minority. In 1631 Amyraut was appointed by the national synod to present the king with 'The Copy of Their Complaints and Grievances for the Infractions and Violations of the Edict of Nantes'. Amyraut agreed to represent his church if the synod would authorize him to stand (along with the Catholic representatives) while addressing the king. Cardinal Richelieu himself met with Amyraut in an attempt to get him to kneel before the king, but Amyraut stubbornly refused and eventually had his way.<sup>65</sup>

In 1634 Amyraut published the book that would be the focus of the controversy around him for the rest of his life.<sup>66</sup> *Brief Traité de la predestination et de ses principales dependance* was Amyraut's attempt to carry on Cameron's project of moving Reformed theology away from its focus on predestination. In this book, Amyraut presented his understanding of predestination as a special case of God's general providence. Cameron had understood such a relationship to exist between the universal phenomenon of the intellect operating on the will, conversion being a special case of an ordinary action of the intelligence on the will, due to the Holy Spirit's infusion of knowledge of God. In outlining his doctrine of predestination, Amyraut applied this dynamic to the relationship between providence and election. He saw providence as a manifestation of God's universal election, whereas Christian election is a special instance of God's providence. In the same way, Amyraut saw creation as God's universal redemption and Christian redemption as a special instance of God's creation. This was the way that Amyraut viewed all of Christian theology: everything had two components, 'universal and natural' and 'special and of grace'<sup>67</sup>—the latter always existing inside the former as a particular manifestation of God's grace.

From this perspective on God's universal and particular action, Amyraut could argue that everyone had been exposed to God's grace in some form or another, and this enabled him to leave open the possibility of salvation for those 'heathen' who had never heard the gospel. But the question that remained unanswered by Amyraut was how hypothetical universal grace changed into a real and particular grace. Amyraut's critics understood him to be saying that the individual will made the change, and therefore they accused Amyraut of Arminianism. Amyraut's defenders understood him to be saying that God effected the change, and therefore they saw him remaining within the bounds of the Synod of Dort.

How William Penn happened to end up in the midst of this debate at the Saumur Academy is difficult to say. John Owen certainly would not have recommended that Penn study under Amyraut. On a number of occasions, Owen had criticized Amyraut's moderate Calvinist doctrine.<sup>68</sup> Furthermore, if William Sr was upset with Owen's influence, he would have had even less enthusiasm for Amyraut's ideas, which had drawn charges of heresy on three separate occasions. In any event, Penn arrived at Saumur in 1662. While all of Penn's biographers assume that Amyraut was one of Penn's professors during this period, it should be pointed out that there is no conclusive evidence to support or refute this assumption. Amyraut died in January 1664, the year that Penn left Saumur, but there is no indication on Penn's part that these two events were linked.

Herbert Wood has raised an intriguing bit of circumstantial evidence that offers the only challenge to the biographers' assumption. He notes that the title page of the English translation of Amyraut's *Traité des Religions*, which was published in 1660, identifies the author as the 'Late Professor of Divinity at Saumur in France'.<sup>69</sup> It is known that Amyraut suffered a severe fall in 1657. Wood raises the possibility that Amyraut never recovered enough to return to teaching, hence the title page's reference to the 'late' professor. In the end, however, Wood concedes to the scholarly consensus that Amyraut did, in fact, recover enough to return to teaching while Penn was a student.<sup>70</sup>

While historians are willing to agree that Penn was exposed to the teaching of Amyraut, their opinions as to the importance of this exposure vary widely. At one end of the spectrum, Bonamy Dobrée asserts that 'Amyraut was clearly one of the major influences in the formation of Penn's mind'.<sup>71</sup> At the other extreme, Brailsford is reluctant to give any significance at all to this exposure, based on her contention that Penn was too independent of a thinker to be influenced by others.<sup>72</sup> Yet Brailsford's thesis reflects her Quaker bias. There can be no doubt that Penn turned out to be a great man, but when he arrived at Saumur he was not yet eighteen years old and was still in the process of forming his principles.

For Quaker historian William Comfort, the matter of Saumur's influence on Penn was of sufficient importance that he took the trouble to write to the *Société de l'Histoire du protestantisme français* in order to inquire after any mention of Penn in the archives of the Saumur Academy. Comfort revealed the outcome of this enquiry in his *Tercentenary Estimate*: 'We should welcome some knowledge of Penn's life at Saumur.'<sup>73</sup> But M. Pannier, the learned librarian of the Protestant library in Paris, told the writer in 1937 that he had searched the Saumur records without finding a trace of Penn's activities there.<sup>74</sup>

Without wanting to give too much importance to Amyraut's influence, Comfort nevertheless sees this period as crucial in Penn's intellectual development. In Comfort's assessment, this was a time when 'the future Quaker steeped himself in the Church Fathers and in those masters of theological dogma whose writings served him so frequently in his later polemics'.<sup>75</sup>

In addition to the likely professor-student relationship between Amyraut and Penn, some second-hand sources from the period report that Penn may have boarded with Amyraut,<sup>76</sup> a claim that, if true, would support the thesis that

Amyraut was one of Penn's formative influences. William Sewell, who knew Penn personally, claimed that Penn once mentioned to him that he had lived with 'the famous preacher, Moyses Amyraut'<sup>77</sup> and Endy cites a report from a casual acquaintance of Penn that the Quaker had once referred to his time at Saumur as 'the major theological training in his life'.<sup>78</sup>

#### WILLIAM PENN ON RELIGIOUS TOLERATION

The bulk of Penn's writings on religious liberty (freedom of conscience) was done in the period between his 'convincement' of Quakerism (1666/67) and the mid-1670s, with the most productive time being before Penn left on his first missionary trip to Holland and Germany in the fall of 1671. It was also during this four year period (1667–1671) that Penn experienced the most persecution for his newly adopted beliefs.

Up until the end of 1668, Quakers were being heavily persecuted under the 1661 Conventicle Act, which had originally been passed out of fear for seditious Catholic groups, but had been amended in 1664 to apply to Quakers as well. In September 1667, Penn was arrested along with a group of fellow Quakers for holding a worship meeting at Cork, Ireland. Penn's stay in jail was cut short due to his personal appeal to the Earl of Orrery. In 1668 he was again brought before a magistrate for participating in dissenting worship, and again he was set free with the help of friends in high places.

Penn was not so fortunate in November of 1668 when he published his third major piece of Quaker apologetic, *The Sandy Foundation Shaken*. In this work Penn challenged the commonly held understandings of the doctrines of the Trinity, Christ's substitutionary atonement, and the imputation of righteousness to the elect. He was understood to have rejected the divinity of Christ and within a month he was arrested on the technicality that he had failed to obtain a publishing license from the Bishop of London. Penn remained in the Tower of London for more than nine months, during which time he wrote *No Cross, No Crown*, explaining how he had come to find true faith among the Quakers, in contrast to the false religion all around. In order to secure his release, Penn undertook to write *Innocency with her Open Eyes, presented by way of Apology for the Book entitled 'The Sandy Foundation Shaken'*. Penn did not renounce his position in this apology; rather he wanted to clear up the confusion that had led some to believe he had denied the divinity of Christ.

While Penn was in the tower, Parliament had allowed the Conventicle Act to lapse without renewal. After Penn was released he spent much of the following year working for the release of his fellow Quakers in jail throughout England and Ireland. By 1670 Parliament reinstated the Conventicle Act and in August 1670, Penn was arrested along with William Mead for preaching to a gathering of Quakers outside a locked meeting house in London. Penn and Mead's trial at the Old Bailey, recorded in *The People's Ancient and just Liberties Asserted*, was the occasion of Penn's well-known defence of the fundamental rights of Englishmen.

His further reflections on the trial were published in 1670 as *An Appendix by Way of Defense for the Prisoners*.

Although Penn and Mead were acquitted on the charge that they had violated the Conventicle Act, within six months Penn was again brought before the bench and charged with breaking the Oxford Five-Mile Act, which prohibited Independent clergy from preaching within a radius of five miles from a former pastorate. Penn argued, to no avail, that this law did not apply to him since he had never been ordained as a minister. He was sentenced to six months in Newgate Prison.

This second lengthy stay in prison gave Penn the opportunity to reflect on his experiences thus far as a persecuted Quaker and to write his most comprehensive argument for religious toleration, *The Great Case of Liberty of Conscience once more briefly debated and defended by the Authority of Reason, Scripture, and Antiquity*. For Penn, liberty of conscience meant the freedom to worship God as one's conscience led and not to be at any civil disadvantage for so doing. Although this theme was never absent from any of Penn's subsequent writings, it always is an echo back to the systematic presentation of ideas in this 1671 publication.

Penn had begun writing *The Great Case of Liberty of Conscience* while he was still in Ireland working to gain the freedom of his fellow Quakers. The ideas that he expressed in more detailed form in this work are evident in his various earlier apologetic pieces. In *No Cross, No Crown* and *Truth Exalted* Penn's main concern was to point out how the Quakers alone were living a true Christian lifestyle. He gave a scathing critique of the Catholics, the Anglicans, and the 'Separatists of diverse names'<sup>79</sup> for falling away from true religion. All three groups were indicted because they rely on human doctrines over heartfelt faith,<sup>80</sup> but the Anglicans received the majority of Penn's criticism because they were persecuting the Quakers who were living in 'the power and spirit' of the original Anglican principle of reformation.<sup>81</sup> The Independents were criticized for their denial of 'that light, wherewith Christ hath enlightened every man'<sup>82</sup> and for their reliance on the doctrine of predestination, which Penn saw as an encouragement to antinomianism:

Though they are never so corrupt, vile, and polluted in themselves, yet are they reconciled to, and justified in the sight of God, by his personal righteousness imputed to them, and not from a work of grace or regeneration in the creature; therefore no wonder at your vehement cries against a state of perfect separation from sin, as being a dangerous doctrine, who preach acceptance with the holy God, whilst in an unholy state.<sup>83</sup>

*No Cross, No Crown* was Penn's call for a Christian lifestyle of holiness. Among the moral prescriptions in this work Penn made his argument for dropping the social conventions of the removal of one's hat and the use of honorific titles as shows of deference. Penn offered a long list of precedents from antiquity, the early Fathers, and contemporary writers, concluding with references to 'Amaraldus' and 'Dalleus', the Latin names for his professor at Saumur and one of Amyraut's main supporters, Jean Daillé.<sup>84</sup>

In *Innocency with her Open Face*, Penn presented his grounds for religious toleration as an appeal to the Anglicans, and particularly to the Independents, to grant the Quakers the same liberties that they themselves had so valued:

Above all, you, who refuse conformity to others, and that have been writing these eight years for liberty of conscience [since the Restoration], and take it at this very season by an indulgent connivance, what pregnant testimonies do you give of your unwillingness to grant that to others you so earnestly beg for yourselves?<sup>85</sup>

The argument for religious liberty that Penn developed in the account of his famous 1670 trial is based almost entirely on English common law. However, it is Penn's interpretation of the common law in light of his understanding of Christian faith arising out of the individual's response to the inner light of Christ that makes Penn's argument unique. Penn interpreted his trial as having broad implications for the fundamental laws of England. As he put it, the outcome of his trial would reveal whether the rule of law in England was based on the 'Magna Charta' or a 'magna farta'.<sup>86</sup>

Penn distinguished between what he understood to be the 'ancient fundamental laws' of liberty and property and the 'superficial laws' which might be altered for the 'good of the kingdom'.<sup>87</sup> He argued that matters of conscience can never be used as a reason for withholding an Englishman's liberty or property. This was particularly the case with religious belief, 'being [a] matter of opinion about faith and worship, which is as various as the unconstant apprehensions of men'.<sup>88</sup> In light of the shifting religious factions that had disrupted England and Europe in the preceding century, Penn emphasized that there was no religious party that could legitimately claim infallibility. On the other hand, the common law which had been established before these troubles was a proven constant, when duly enforced. He wrote, 'If the civil privileges of the people had fallen with the pretended religious privileges of the popish tyranny, at the first reformation...our case had ended here, that we had obtained a spiritual freedom, at the cost of civil bondage: which certainly was from the intention of the first reformers'.<sup>89</sup>

Penn developed these ideas further in *The Great Case of Liberty of Conscience*. The point of this book was to demonstrate that a Christian faith which arises out of one's conscience in response to God cannot be suppressed without at the same time undermining the fundamental English freedoms. Penn gave a number of reasons why this was the case, but in each instance the basic assumption is that the primacy of the Holy Spirit speaking to the individual heart must be preserved: (1) God speaks to the individual heart through the endowed gifts of "understanding, reason, judgment, and faith",<sup>90</sup> therefore enforced conformity of belief denies these gifts and God's word which comes through them; (2) there are no infallible voices for doctrine and practice other than one's own heart conviction;<sup>91</sup> and (3) an imposition of belief defeats God's work of grace in the individual's soul.<sup>92</sup> In summary, imposition of belief and coerced conformity of practice rob the individual of 'that instinct of Deity, which is so natural to him, that he can be no more without it, and be, than he can be without the most essential part of himself. For to what serves that divine principle in the universality of mankind, if men be restricted by the prescriptions of some individuals?'<sup>93</sup>



On the practical side, Penn noted that restriction of freedom of conscience results in unstable government. He cited the examples of English unrest and twice mentioned the situation in France.<sup>94</sup> He reminded the English government that if it felt that it was now justified in imposing doctrine and practice on its subjects then it is likely that the sovereigns of Catholic states, particularly France, would feel justified in renewing their persecution of Protestants.<sup>95</sup> Penn summed up his argument by returning to the precedent of the Anglican Reformers: either the Quakers must be allowed liberty of conscience or their persecutors ought to return to the 'Romish Church': 'What short of this can any say to the anti-liberty-of-conscience Protestant?'<sup>96</sup>

At the root of Penn's argument from conscience was his conviction of God's universal grace, which he understood to be manifest not only in the universal inner light but also in providence:

Let it not then be unworthy of such to remember, that God affords his refreshing sun to all; the dunghill is no more excepted than the most delightful plain; and his 'rain falls alike both upon the just and unjust'. He strips not mankind of what suits their creaturely preservation; Christians themselves have no more peculiar privilege in the natural benefits of heaven, than Turks or Indians. Would it not then be strange, that infidels themselves, much less any sort of Christians, should be deprived of natural privileges for mere opinion?<sup>97</sup>

Penn gave his most intentional articulation of the Quaker doctrine of universal inner light in his 1674 publication *The Christian Quaker*. The foundation of this work was Penn's assumption that all human beings have the inner light of Christ. Penn's purpose in writing the work was to grapple with how that light brings individuals to a conviction of their sinfulness and a realization of Christ's saving work. Penn contended that there was at least some measure of Christ's saving light in the world before Christ. Pagans such as Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, and Plutarch had arrived at certain essential truths of religion and morality (belief in one eternal being, the communication of the divine light to men, and the need for holy living).<sup>98</sup> Penn's debt to Amyraut is clearest at this point. By insisting that the benefits of Christ's death were intentionally universal and sufficient for all, but only appropriated by some, Penn was presenting his version of Amyraut's 'Hypothetical' Universalism.<sup>99</sup>

While Penn was much more generous than Amyraut in his willingness to recognize salvation among the pious pagans of antiquity, in the end he was no more clear about how one's inner light becomes sufficient for salvation. Perhaps the reason for this was the same dilemma faced by Amyraut. On the one hand, Penn did not want to claim that the responsibility for bringing the inner light to sufficiency for salvation lay entirely with the individual. Such a position would deny any role to the Spirit and power of God. On the other hand, he did not want to give all the responsibility to the Holy Spirit because that would essentially be a doctrine of election, which he despised. Penn satisfied himself with a call for both holy living and heartfelt conviction preserving the mystery of divine love.

## CONCLUSION

Penn's concept of religious toleration shows a substantial correlation to the teaching that he likely would have received at Saumur, both in general and along the specific lines of Amyraut's theology. In general terms, the Huguenot political philosophy which favoured a strong sovereign (as long as that sovereign protected religious toleration) was evident in Penn's royalist position. Considering Penn's Congregationalist sympathies at Oxford and his experiences of persecution as a new Quaker, his challenge to the government to live up to the covenant of the Magna Carta directly reflects the approach of the Huguenot political theory at Saumur. Penn's recurring references to France and the relative stability that arose out of the toleration of the Edict of Nantes reinforce this point. No doubt Penn saw the Edict's repeal in 1685 as directly connected to the ongoing persecution of Quakers in Protestant England. Penn's understanding of doctrinal certainty, far from reflecting an Independent perspective, correlates with the undercurrent of suspicion with regard to dogmatic declaration from tradition that resulted from the combination of Louis Cappel's textual criticism and Jean Daillé's challenge to the authority of the early Church Fathers. More specifically, there is in Penn's theology a further development of Amyraut's emphasis on the conviction of the Holy Spirit as validation of intellectual assent.

It is also significant to note that Penn's understanding of original sin was very much a confirmation of the fears of the opponents of Josué de la Place's theory of mediate imputation. Penn emphasized human accountability for actual sinful behaviour, but the idea that human beings were guilty for Adam's transgression made no sense to him. De la Place had argued that actual sinning was the basis of every person's participation in original sin—that is, actual sin arises out of every human's hereditary condition. Therefore he believed that the doctrine of immediate imputation was unjust on the grounds that Adam's posterity was not present when Adam sinned. De la Place's opponents also argued from the point of view of God's justice, but they simply claimed that Adam's posterity was present *in actus* and therefore bears the immediate imputed guilt. Penn took De la Place's approach to imputed sin even further; he rejected both immediate imputed sin and immediately imputed righteousness.<sup>100</sup>

Perhaps the area of influence that can be traced most clearly back to Penn's time at Saumur is his concern for ecumenism. Brailsford paints a picture of academic life at Saumur as 'the complete absence of sectarian jealousy and religious quarrels'.<sup>101</sup> This is certainly an idealised reconstruction, given the sole fact that Amyraut needed to petition the French Court regarding violations of the Edict of Nantes. Nevertheless, it does appear that there was more ecumenical cooperation in Saumur than was commonly the case. Saumur Academy founder Duplessis-Mornay governed the town for 32 years, but the next two governors were Roman Catholics who continued to support the Academy.<sup>102</sup> Furthermore, the Academy never adopted a creedal statement. Richard Stauffer has called Amyraut a 'French Precursor of Ecumenicism' and considers Penn to have taken

up this concern more than any other while studying under Amyraut.<sup>103</sup> Schmidt's study of 'Ecumenical Activity on the Continent of Europe in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries' also considers this area of Amyraut's influence on Penn to be primary. 'This, if nothing else', writes Schmidt, 'would ensure for [Saumur] an important place in the ecumenical story'.<sup>104</sup>

Beyond noting the correlation between Penn's Quaker rejection of hat-honour and Amyraut's refusal to kneel before the king of France, Amyraut's development of Cameron's understanding of covenant theology correlates with Penn's understanding of the theological basis for religious toleration. Not only was grace threatened by enforced conformity of belief, the work of God's Spirit on the individual's conscience was denied any role. Penn could argue for religious toleration on practical, legal grounds, but what gave him the strength to pursue the cause was his conviction that God has shown his grace to all persons, and within this circle of universal grace, God's Spirit operates to convict each person of their inner light for salvation. Any denial of this work of particular grace was a direct usurpation of God's role. For Penn, a national policy of religious toleration was essential for keeping the government from becoming idolatrous.

William Penn left no direct testimony to the sources of his intellectual and theological development. This fact is the primary difficulty confronting the historian who attempts to locate the main influences on Penn's conception of religious toleration. A further complication is the sheer number of different ideologies and persons with whom Penn came into contact: royalists, Whigs, humanist philosophers, Puritan Independents, Commonwealth Protestants, European and English nobility, French Huguenots, Labadists, and, of course, the Quakers. Through an investigation of the possible influences on Penn up to when he wrote the majority of his works on religious toleration, one can see that the major influences often credited in Penn's development—contemporary European philosophy and two years of study at Oxford—are much less plausible than his two years at the Saumur Academy in France under the instruction of Moses Amyraut.

#### NOTES

\* This paper was first published in the *Journal of Church and State* 35 (1993), pp. 83-112 and is republished with permission and minor changes.

1. Quaker Historian Hugh Barbour notes that the commercial rights to the name 'Wm. Penn' belong to British Petroleum, Ltd. Barbour, H.S. (ed.), *William Penn on Religion and Ethics: The Emergence of Liberal Quakerism*, Studies in American Religion 53, Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1991, I, p. 1.

2. See Beatty, E.C., *William Penn as Social Philosopher*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1939, p. 99; Taylor, F.R., 'William Penn, Constitution Maker', in H.H. Brinton (ed.), *Children of Light: Essays in Honor of Rufus M. Jones*, New York: Macmillan, 1938, pp. 47-48.

3. See Noll, M., Hatch, N., and Marsden, G., *The Search for Christian America*, Westchester, IL: Crossway Books, 1983.

4. Quoted from Poulson's *American Dailey Advertiser*, 28 October 1826, in Comfort, W.W., *William Penn and Our Liberties*, Philadelphia: Penn Mutual Life Insurance Co., 1947, p. 131.

5. Comfort, *Liberties*, p. 121.

6. Taylor, 'Constitution Maker', p. 52
7. 'The Convincement of William Penn', *The Journal of the Friends' Historical Society* 32 (1935), pp. 22-26.
8. See Brailsford, M.R., *The Making of William Penn*, New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1930, p. 95; Comfort, W.W., *William Penn, 1644-1718: A Tercentenary Estimate*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1944, p. 4; 'Memoirs of the Life of William Penn', in W. Evans and T. Evans (eds.), *The Friends' Library Comprising Journals, Doctrinal Treatises, and other Writings of Members of the Religious Society of Friends*, Philadelphia: Joseph Rakestraw, 1841, V, p. 24; Wildes, H.E., *William Penn*, New York: Macmillan, 1974, p. 5.
9. Comfort, 'Memoirs of the Life of William Penn', V, p. 24.
10. Wildes, *William Penn*, p. 301; Harison, J., and Laslett, P., *The Library of John Locke*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.
11. Taylor, 'Constitution Maker', 35, makes the argument that: 'it is by no means an overstatement of the situation to claim for William Penn a crucial influence upon John Locke in formulating the democratic ideal of "consent" in the great philosopher's concepts of the origin and basis of governmental power'.
12. W.S. Hudson notes that it was not until after Locke took a trip in 1665 to Brandenburg, where he was amazed to discover a well-functioning policy of religious toleration, that he began to change his views on freedom of conscience. 'John Locke: Heir of Puritan Political Theorists', in G.L. Hunt and J.T. McNeil (eds.), *Calvinism and the Political Order: Essays Prepared for the Woodrow Wilson Lectureship of the National Presbyterian Center*, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965, p. 112; see also Hudson's 'William Penn's English Liberties: A Tract for Several Times', *William and Mary Quarterly* 26 (October 1969), pp. 580-81.
13. Wildes, *William Penn*, p. 85.
14. Taylor, 'Constitution Maker', p. 43.
15. Taylor, 'Constitution Maker', p. 41; see also Nash, G., *Quakers and Politics, 1681-1726*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1968, p. 30.
16. Brailsford, *The Making of William Penn*, p. 102.
17. Beatty's work, *William Penn as Social Philosopher*, is a good example of this tendency.
18. See Endy, M.B., *William Penn and Early Quakerism*, Princeton, NJ.: Princeton University Press, 1973, pp. 96-98; see also Wildes, *William Penn*, pp. 26-27; Brailsford, *The Making of William Penn*, pp. 95-96, 98.
19. Brailsford, *The Making of William Penn*, p. 102.
20. Owen attacked Quaker theology in a number of his writings, including 'Vindiciae Evangelicae...' (1655), in *Works*, XII, p. 12 and 'Of the Divine Original, Self-Evidencing Light, and Power of the Scriptures' (1659), in *Works*, XVI, p. 292.
21. Brailsford, *The Making of William Penn*, pp. 98, 98-99.
22. Penn, W., 'Innocency with her Open Face' (1668), in *The Select Works of William Penn*, New York: Kraus Reprint Co., 1971, I, p. 164.
23. Penn, 'Travels in Holland and Germany: The Journal' (1677), in *Select Works*, II, p. 464. See also Penn, 'Truth Exalted', in *Select Works*, I, p. 121.
24. Endy, *Early Quakerism*, p. 98.
25. Beatty, *Social Philosopher*, p. 6; Peare, C.O., *William Penn: A Biography*, New York: J.B. Lippincott, 1957, p. 35; Endy, *Early Quakerism*, pp. 97-98, 98n.
26. Peare, *Biography*, pp. 28-29.
27. Taylor, 'Constitution Maker', pp. 32-33.
28. Woodbridge, F.J.E., 'Hobbes', in *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1913, VI, pp. 728-31.
29. See Penn's critical reference to Hobbes's *Leviathan* in 'The Great Case of Liberty of Conscience' (1670), in *Select Works*, II, p. 140.

30. In Peare's opinion (*Biography*, p. 29), 'Hugo Grotius develops as one of the most significant of contemporary influences on Penn's thinking during his college days, an influence that registers only gradually as it combined with the concepts of Thomas Loe, Moses Amyraut and the whole Quaker movement'.

31. Penn, W., 'No Cross, No Crown', in Barbour (ed.), *William Penn*, I, p. 109. Barbour has helpfully reprinted the original 1669 version of 'No Cross, No Crown', rather than the much longer and more developed second version published in 1682.

32. See Armstrong, B.G., *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy: Protestant Scholasticism and Humanism in Seventeenth-Century France*, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969, pp. 124-27.

33. Brailsford, *The Making of William Penn*, p. 112.

34. Comfort, *Tercentenary*, p. 6; Peare, *Biography*, pp. 42-43; Brailsford, *The Making of William Penn*, p. 125.

35. Brailsford, *The Making of William Penn*, p. 125.

36. Winthrop Hudson makes a very good case that the work entitled *English Liberties*, reprints of which were to play an important role in America as a general legal handbook, was largely Penn's own work. A substantial portion of the booklet was taken from tracts written by Penn in support of Sidney's run for Parliament in 1679; 'William Penn's English Liberties: A Tract for Several Times', p. 581.

37. Wildes, *William Penn*, p. 35.

38. *The Diary of Samuel Pepys: A New and Complete Transcription*, ed. R. Lathan and W. Matthews, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970, III, pp. 17, 21. See also Brailsford, *The Making of William Penn*, p. 107.

39. *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, III, p. 73.

40. Yardeni, M., 'French Calvinist Political Thought, 1534-1715', in M. Prestwich (ed.), *International Calvinism: 1541-1715*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985, p. 319.

41. Yardeni, 'French Calvinist', pp. 319-20.

42. Yardeni, 'French Calvinist', pp. 323-24.

43. Labrousse, 'Calvinism in France, 1598-1685'; Prestwich, *International Calvinism*, p. 302.

44. 'Gomarus, Franz', in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th edn, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911, XII, p. 228.

45. Armstrong, *Amyraut Heresy*, pp. 60-61.

46. 'Cameron, John', in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, V, p. 108.

47. Labrousse, 'Calvinism in France', p. 302. See also Armstrong, *Amyraut Heresy*, p. 88.

48. La Planche, F., *Orthodoxie et Prédication: l'oeuvre d'Amyraut et la querelle de la grace universelle*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1965, p. 41.

49. See G.P. Hutchinson, *The Problem of Original Sin in American Presbyterian Thought*, International Library of Philosophy and Theology, ed. R.L. Reymond, Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1972, p. 10.

50. Shedd, W.G.T., *A History of Christian Doctrine*, 14th edn, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902, II, p. 162.

51. Armstrong, *Amyraut Heresy*, pp. 104-105.

52. 'Cappel, Louis', in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, V, p. 288.

53. Armstrong, *Amyraut Heresy*, p. 125.

54. Daillé (Dallaeus) Jean', in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, XII, p. 737.

55. See Schmidt, M., 'The Ecumenical Activity on the Continent of Europe in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries', in R. Rouse and S.C. Neil (eds.), *A History of the Ecumenical Movement, 1517-1948*, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968, p. 88.

56. Armstrong, *Amyraut Heresy*, pp. 11-12.

57. Armstrong, *Amyraut Heresy*, p. 148.

58. 'Amyraut, Moses', in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th edn, I, p. 901. See also Armstrong, *Amyraut Heresy*, pp. 71-119.

59. Armstrong, *Amyraut Heresy*, pp. 52-53.
60. Armstrong, *Amyraut Heresy*, p. 54.
61. Armstrong, *Amyraut Heresy*, p. 55; Lindsay, T.M., 'Amyraldism', in *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1908, I, p. 404.
62. Armstrong, *Amyraut Heresy*, p. 59.
63. Schmidt, 'Ecumenical Activity', p. 97.
64. Schmidt, 'Ecumenical Activity', p. 88; Armstrong, *Amyraut Heresy*, p. 7.
65. 'Amyraut, Moses', in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, I, p. 901.
66. Nichole, R., 'Amyraldianism, Amyraldism, Amyraldus, Amyraut', in *Encyclopedia of Christianity*, ed. E.H. Palmer, Wilmington, DE: National Foundation for Christian Education, 1964, I, p. 185.
67. Lindsay, 'Amyraldism', p. 405.
68. Endy, *Early Quakerism*, n. 98, cites John Owen, 'Vindiciae Evangelicae...', in *Works* XII, p. 49; 'Salus Electorum' (1647), in *Works*, X, p. 222; and 'Of Schism' (1657), in *Works*, XIII, pp. 138, 195.
69. Wood, H.G., 'William Penn's *The Christian Quaker*', in Brinton (ed.), *Children of Light*, p. 6.
70. 'William Penn's *The Christian Quaker*', p. 7.
71. Dobrée, B., *William Penn: Quaker and Pioneer*, New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1932, p. 15.
72. Brailsford, *The Making of William Penn*, p. 120.
73. 'Influence d'Amiraut sur W. Penn', in 'Correspondance', *Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire du protestantisme français* 86 (Paris, 1937), p. 526.
74. Comfort, *Tercentenary*, p. 6.
75. Comfort, *Tercentenary*, p. 6.
76. 'Séances du Comité', *Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire du protestantisme français* 62 (1913), p. 174; see also 'William Penn à Saumur', *Bulletin* 62 (1913), p. 94.
77. Sewell, W., *The History of the Rise, Increase, and Progress of the Christian People Called Quakers*, repr., Philadelphia: Uriah Hunt, 1832, p. 77.
78. Story by E.Q. in *Gentleman's Magazine*, August 1737, cited in Endy, *Early Quakerism*, p. 99.
79. Penn, 'Truth Exalted', in *Select Works*, I, p. 123.
80. Penn, 'Truth Exalted', I, pp. 119, 121, 123.
81. Penn, 'Truth Exalted', I, p. 120.
82. Penn, 'Truth Exalted', I, p. 124.
83. Penn, 'Truth Exalted', I, p. 123.
84. Penn, 'No Cross, No Crown' (1682), in Barbour (ed.), *William Penn*, I, p. 417.
85. Penn, 'Innocency', I, p. 164.
86. Penn, 'Appendix, by way of Defence for the Prisoners' (1670), in *Select Works*, I, p. 221.
87. Penn, 'Appendix', I, pp. 202-203; Penn, 'The People's ancient and just Liberties asserted in the Trial of William Penn and William Mead', in *Select Works*, I, p. 187.
88. Penn, 'Appendix', I, p. 215.
89. Penn, 'Appendix', I, p. 215. See Penn, 'England's Present Interest Considered', in *Select Works*, II, p. 296; Penn, 'Great Case', II, pp. 145, 155.
90. Penn, 'Great Case', II, p. 135.
91. Penn, 'Great Case', II, p. 135; see Penn, 'A Letter to the Council and State of the City of Embden', in *Select Works*, II, p. 210.
92. Penn, 'Great Case', II, p. 136.
93. Penn, 'Great Case', II, p. 140.
94. Penn, 'Great Case', II, pp. 145, 155.
95. Penn, 'Great Case', II, p. 145.

96. Penn, 'Great Case', II, p. 149.
97. Penn, 'The Proposed Comprehension Soberly and not Unseasonably Considered' (1672), in *Select Works*, II, p. 196; see also Penn, 'Letter to the Council', II, p. 202.
98. Penn, 'Christian Quaker', in *Select Works*, I, p. 230.
99. Wood, 'The Christian Quaker', p. 18.
100. Penn, 'The Sandy Foundation Shaken', in *Select Works*, I, p. 251.
101. Brailsford, *The Making of William Penn*, p. 121.
102. Schmidt, 'Ecumenical Activity', p. 88.
103. Stauffer, R., *Moïse Amyraut: un Précurseur français de l'œcuménisme*, Paris: Librairie protestante, 1962), pp. 53-54.
104. Schmidt, 'Ecumenical Activity', p. 88.

#### AUTHOR DETAILS

Kenneth R. Morris has a MA in Christian Ethics from New College for Advanced Christian Studies in Berkeley, CA, an MTS from Duke Divinity School in Durham, NC, and a JD from Boalt Hall School of Law, in Berkeley, CA. He lives with his family in Boulder, CO, where he works as an attorney.

Mailing address: c/o *Quaker Studies*.