In 1812 a document, alleged to be the original Charter of Charles II to William Penn for his province in America, was deposited with the Secretary of the Commonwealth at Harrisburg. It has since been transferred to the State Archives and is now on exhibit in the State Museum. If authentic, it is beyond question the basic historical manuscript of Pennsylvania's record; it marks the formal beginning of her history.

Although at first accepted as the original copy of the royal grant, its authenticity was later challenged by many writers and historians. Their arguments may be summarized as follows:

1. Many historians have recorded the fact that Charles II signed the Charter on March 4, 1680/1. As his signature is not on the copy at Harrisburg, that copy cannot be the original.

2. William Brooke Rawle made the statement that the Harrisburg copy “is not a copy of the Charter as it ultimately passed the Great Seal, but merely a copy of the record of the Charter as it passed the Privy Seal.”

1 This statement is to be found in most histories of Pennsylvania and in most biographies of William Penn.

2 The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography (PMHB), XVI (1892), 91.
3. Circumstantial evidence indicated that a Penn agent, John Cadwalader, had sent the original Charter to a lawyer in York, Pennsylvania, in 1844, and it had never been returned.  

4. The Harrisburg document bears an endorsement dated June 27, 1682, thereby indicating that it was simply a certified copy of later date than the original.  

Mr. Rawle's attack on the Harrisburg copy was published in this magazine in 1892 under the title, "Where is The Original of the Charter of Charles The Second to William Penn For The Province of Pennsylvania?" It is thus fitting that an answer to this conundrum should appear in these pages. However, before the arguments given above can be considered, it will first be necessary to trace the preparation of the original document and to detail the few facts which have come to light concerning its whereabouts during the past two and one-half centuries.  

Notice of Penn's first formal effort to secure his grant is found in early English records, which show that by order of the King the Earl of Sunderland referred a petition of Penn's to the Lords of Trade and Plantations on June 1, 1680. It then became the duty of that committee of the Privy Council to study the petition, praying that Penn be granted a tract of land in America, and to report on it to His Majesty.  

The Lords of Trade consulted with Penn from time to time, and referred copies of his petition to the agents of the Duke of York and Lord Baltimore to determine how far Penn's desires agreed with the boundaries of Maryland and the Duke's properties. In due course the Duke's approval was secured, and on November 4, 1680, the

---

3 Mr. Rawle states that a box of Penn title deeds was delivered to him by General George Cadwalader, sometime after 1869. In this box was a letter of Judge John Cadwalader, dated November 9, 1844, and addressed to Thomas C. Hambly in York. The letter lists various documents that Cadwalader was sending to Hambly, the first of which was "1681—Charter to W. Penn." From this, Mr. Rawle concluded that the original charter had never been turned over to the state at all, but had been sent to Hambly and never returned. *Ibid.*, 87.  

4 Scharf and Westcott took this view in their 1884 *History of Philadelphia*, 1, 83. Other historians accepted and repeated this statement.  

5 *PMHB*, XVI (1892), 86-92. Mr. Rawle, however, had questioned the authenticity of the document as early as 1880. *Ibid.*, IV (1880), 513.  

6 *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies, 1677-1680* (London, 1896), 544, item 1373. A fragment of Penn's petition, all that remained of the original, was printed on page 51 of the *Breviate of Penn v. Baltimore*. It may also be found in Samuel Hazard's *Annals of Pennsylvania, 1609-1682* (Philadelphia, 1850), 474.
Lords of Trade recorded "A draft Patent submitted by Mr. Penn ordered to be shown to Lord Baltimore's agents and the Attorney-General." Later in the same month this draft was examined by Lord Chief Justice North.7

By February 24 of the following year the draft of the grant had reached its final stages. On that day it was read to the Lords of Trade and Plantations, and "there being a blank left for the name agreed to leave the nomination to the King." Accordingly, William Blathwayt, secretary of the committee, drafted the following letter:8

May it please yr Majy:

In obediance to yr. Majy: orders signified unto us by the E. of Sunderland on the first of June last We have prepared the Draught of a Charter constituting William Pen Esq Absolute Proprietary of a Tract of Land in America therein mentioned, Which We humbly present to yr Majy: for yr. Royall Approbatn leaving also the naming of the sd. Province unto yr. Majy:

Which is most humby submitted

24th: of Feb. 1680/1

When this draft was brought before the King in Privy Council on February 25, he was pleased to approve it, "And did Order, that one of his Principall Secretarys of State do give Directions for preparing a Bill for his Majestys Royall Signature to passe the Great Seale of England, according to the said draft (which was thereunto annexed) and that his Majestys Principall Secretary of State do receive his Majestys Pleasure, what Name he will give the said Province, to the end the same may be inserted in the said Bill accordingly."9

It would then have been in order for the Secretary of State to prepare a warrant to the Attorney General ordering the preparation

7 Calendar of State Papers, 625, 628, 629, 632, items 1574, 1580, 1584, 1592. An account of the processing of Penn's petition and draft patent may be found in greater detail in the Breviate.
8 Photostatic copy of Blathwayt's draft. Photostatic copies of the English documents as well as other manuscripts cited, unless otherwise specified, are in The Historical Society of Pennsylvania.
9 Acts of The Privy Council of England. Colonial Series (Hereford, 1910), II, 17, item 28. This printed transcript records February 23 as the date of the draft's appearance before the King. This is an error. A check of the original entry (page 224, Privy Council Register, Charles II, Volume 16, P.C. 2/69, Public Record Office) gives the date as February 25.
of the King’s bill. This warrant went to the Clerk of the Patents, who made a fair copy of it and sent it on to the Attorney General. Such warrants became the property of the recipient and are, therefore, not in public hands. The Attorney General then transmitted the draft of the patent to the Patent Bill Office, where a copy was made and returned to him for approval. Upon obtaining this it was sent back to the Patent Office and copied on parchment. Two transcripts of the engrossed copy were also made, one being sent to the Privy Signet Office and one to the Privy Seal Office. The engrossed copy became the King’s bill and was presented to Charles for his royal signature.

Charles signed the top of each of the three sheets constituting the King’s bill, Charles R. The concluding line of the last sheet contained some blanks: “Witnesse Ourselze at Westminster the in the yeare of our Reigne .” Those blanks were not filled in, but the necessary information was added by endorsement of the Lord Chancellor, Lord Finch, who wrote on the face of this sheet “Heneage Finch Feb 28th 1680/1.” This may be taken as evidence that the King signed the bill on that day, a Monday, probably in the Chancellor’s presence. The bill took its date from the latter’s endorsement, as did the bills of signet and privy seal which passed on the same day.

It is proper at this point to note that the only document the King signed was the King’s bill. This was a bill authorizing the passage of a charter—it was not the charter itself. Moreover, it was signed on February 28. Because of this, historians who record that Charles signed the Charter on March 4 are not exact either in their dating or in their document. We can thus disregard the first argument listed against the Harrisburg document.

The signed King’s bill was immediately transmitted to the Privy Signet Office as authority for that office to issue the signet bill. The Clerk of the Signet Office having compared the bill with the transcript of it sent to him by the Patent Office, collated the transcript with the King’s bill, and transformed it into a bill of privy signet by


11 Photostatic copy of the King’s bill.
addressing it to the Privy Seal Office and adding his signature and the date. This new bill then went to the Secretary of State for the affixing of the King's signet. The King's bill remained in the Signet Office; it is today in the custody of the Public Record Office in London.

The signet bill with signet attached then went to the Lord Privy Seal and became his warrant for making out a writ of privy seal. (In passing, it should be added that most of the signet bills were retained by the Lords Privy Seal and are not preserved in official custody. The existence of the copy for the Penn grant, therefore, is not known.) The writ of privy seal was prepared by taking the transcript of the King's bill, which the Clerk of the Patents had sent to the Privy Seal Office, and by adding to its beginning the following sentence: "Charles the Second by the grace of God King of England Scotland France and Ireland Defender of the faith etc To our Right Trusty and Wellbeloved Councillor Heneage Lord Finch our Chancellor of England greeting wee will and command you that under our Great Seale of England remaining in your custody you cause our Letters to be made forth patents in forme following." Then follow the terms of the grant. At the end of the grant is added a concluding sentence: "In Witnesse etc Witnesse etc Given under our privy seale at our palace of Westminster the eight and Twentyeth day of February in the Three and Thirtyeth yeare of our Reigne." This document was then folded in a peculiar manner and encircled by a ribbon of parchment, which passed through slits cut in each of its three pages. The ends of the ribbon, as well as the Charter itself, were then sealed together by the privy seal. The writ of privy seal then became to all intents the completed patent, although not legally binding until the Great Seal had been affixed. For this purpose it was sent to the Lord Chancellor.

It would appear that the Lord Chancellor did not receive the writ until Friday, March 4, 1680/1. His voucher for the preparation of the Charter for the Great Seal was the privy seal itself which he was

---

12 Public Record Office, King's Bills for February, 1680/1 (S.O. 7/65, February Roll), m. 1-3. Also see entry in Signet Office Docquet Books, 1677-1686 (Index 6817), February, 1680.

13 Photostatic copy of the writ of privy seal.

forced to break in order to open the document. Having opened it, he wrote at its foot "Recepi, 4 Martii. 8o." This then became the authority for the proper officials to prepare the letters patent for the grant. This was done by deleting the opening sentence of the privy seal bill and substituting for its concluding sentence, as quoted above, the following: "In Witness whereof Wee have caused these our letters to be made patents, Witness our selfe at Westminster, the fourth day of March, in the three and thirtieth year of our Reigne." After the date, both the Charter at Harrisburg and the Delaware Charter bear the statement, "By Writt of Privy Seale," and both are signed "Pigott" for Sir Richard Pigott, long-time Clerk of the Patents.

If one will compare the wording of the Harrisburg Charter with the enrollment of the original document in the Public Record Office it will be found that they are very nearly identical. The Harrisburg copy does not incorporate the characteristics of the writ of privy seal. Mr. Rawle was in error in stating that it was a copy of the Charter as it passed the privy seal, not as it passed the Great Seal. The second argument against the Charter's authenticity may be discarded by this simple comparison.\(^{16}\)

The engrossing of the elaborate document may well have taken considerable time. When completed it was returned to the Lord Chancellor for the ceremony of the affixing of the Great Seal of England. After certain other details had been taken care of, the Charter was at last turned over to a representative of William Penn.

It was not unusual to have two or more copies of a charter made, both, or all of which, bore the Great Seal and had equal status as original copies. In the case of the Penn grant, however, evidence indicates that only one copy bearing the Great Seal was made, although a duplicate copy, not bearing the Seal, was also furnished.

\(^{15}\) Photostatic copy of the writ of privy seal.

\(^{16}\) The Charter was enrolled a number of times and in two different forms. The copy found in the Chancery Patent Rolls is similar to the final Charter except that it concludes "at Westmr the eight and twentieth day of ffebruary—By Writt of Privy Seale." The copy preserved in the Colonial Office was taken from the Chancery enrollment above. However, the enrollment found in the Colonial Office, America and West Indies Series, ends in the same way as the Harrisburg Charter: "In Witness whereof we have caused these our Letters to be made Patents. Witness Ourselte at Westmr. the 4th day of March In the Three and Thirtieth Yeare of our Reign." This is also the ending for the enrollment in the Exchequer of the Land Revenue. Photostatic copies.
Fees paid by Penn for the Charter are to be found at the Public Record Office in the *Accounts Various* of the Comptroller of the Hanaper for 1681, and in the *Declared Accounts* of the Keeper of the Hanaper for the same year. In the *Accounts Various* it is recorded that Penn paid the Magna Feoda (Great Fee of the Seal) at the standard rates of £8 9s for the original, and 20s 4d for his duplicate. These charges were made for "carte de magno feodo," a special term of the Hanaper corresponding approximately to grants in perpetuity. In addition, these charges made up but a part of those listed in the *Declared Accounts*, where one finds that Penn paid £12 6s 8d for the Charter, and 21s 4d for the duplicate.\(^\text{17}\)

The point of the above investigation was to determine whether there was more than one Charter issued under the Great Seal. It seems that there was not and that our search is consequently narrowed to one original exemplar.

No evidence has been found to indicate that the Charter ever came to Pennsylvania during William Penn's time. Penn wrote of his meeting Lord Baltimore in Maryland in December, 1682, and that "the first thing I did was to present the King's letter."\(^\text{18}\) The Charter was not mentioned. It is probable that during Penn's absences from England it remained in the custody of his agents. References to it are difficult to find and often vague. From time to time it was used in the seemingly endless Pennsylvania-Maryland boundary disputes.

On November 7, 1734, Fernando John Paris, lawyer for the Penn family, wrote from London to John Penn in Pennsylvania, "I sent for your Brother to Town, got the Originall Charter & Deeds from Mr. Page. . . ."\(^\text{19}\) In 1739 Paris again mentions the Charter in a list of deeds, stating that the items on the list are "mostly in London."\(^\text{20}\) A few years later, a part of the grant was printed in the

---

\(^\text{17}\) Photostatic copies of the pertinent Hanaper entries.

\(^\text{18}\) Letter dated August 14, 1683, Penn Papers, Boundaries, Pennsylvania and Maryland, 4. The original copy of the King's letter is now owned by the Chicago Historical Society. It is dated April 2, 1681, and endorsed to show that it was enrolled in the Rolls Office of Pennsylvania, November 27, 1782.


\(^\text{20}\) Penn Papers, Official Correspondence, III, 87.
Breviate of Penn v. Baltimore, from the "Original Charter under the Great Seal."\textsuperscript{21}

In 1754, Thomas Penn, the head of the family, built a new house in London containing a vaulted strong room "to keep the papers of my Family in, which much concern the Province."\textsuperscript{22} It is more than likely that the Charter was kept in this room. Later it was removed to his country place, Stoke Park, inherited by his son, John Penn, after Thomas Penn’s death in 1775. Negative evidence of this period confirms the theory that the Charter had not come to America, since it is not included in a list of family deeds in the custody of their Philadelphia agent in 1786.\textsuperscript{23}

In 1802, John R. Coates, a Philadelphia lawyer, assumed the agency of the Penn family in America. The following year he journeyed to England and visited John Penn at Stoke Park. A principal object of this visit was to procure title papers which would be of value in a law case pending for the family against the state of Delaware. Coates spent a fortnight at Mr. Penn’s house and had access to all his papers, which he carefully searched for original titles, and, in his own words, "all I could find I brought with me to this country."\textsuperscript{24}

The London firm of Hanrott & Metcalfe drew up a "List of papers taken from England by John R. Coates agent for the Honble John & Richr Penn—1804." This list is composed of one hundred and eighteen entries and represents a collection of tremendous historic interest and value. Item 85 is recorded as "Grant of King Charles 2nd to Wm. Penn 4th March 1680."\textsuperscript{25} Documents representing sixty-two of the listed entries are now at The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, four are in the Delaware Archives, and two in the Pennsylvania Archives. Fifty remain unlocated.

\textsuperscript{21} Breviate, 53.
\textsuperscript{22} Thomas Penn to Richard Peters, November 7, 1754 and October 6, 1755, Penn Letter Book, IV, 23, 166. Prior to this time Paris may have had custody of the Charter since he provided Penn a copy of it in 1750. This copy may be the one found in Penn Papers, Charters and Frame of Government, 23-29.
\textsuperscript{23} Penn Papers, John Penn’s Common Place Book, 16-22.
\textsuperscript{24} Coates list and statement by J. R. Coates, Cadwalader Collection, Thomas Cadwalader, Penn Agency, Box 4.
\textsuperscript{25} Coates list. Among the items included on this list are the Delaware Charter and the three Delaware title deeds which were presented to the state of Delaware by one of Coates’ descendants. They are now in the State Archives at Dover.
In the autumn of 1809, Coates was again in England on business for the Penns, and again visited John Penn at Stoke Park, where once more he had access to the rich family archives. Two years after Coates' return from this second trip the following letter was addressed to Simon Snyder, Governor of Pennsylvania:

Philadelphia, January 20th, 1812

Sir,

Mr. John R. Coates, of this city brought with him two years since, from London, the original charter of Charles the 2nd and the Duke of York, to William Penn; which upon my suggestion, he is willing to deposit among the archives of the state, upon their removal to the fire-proof offices at Harrisburg: Provided a request is made by you, for the papers, or by the legislature; and that public notice be taken of the documents being in their possession.—Mr. Coates, also suggested the propriety of provision being made, for liberty to use them in evidence, as in a recent trial, the accuracy of the printed copies of them, was doubted, by the counsel opposed to the claim of the Penn family, and required the production of the original documents, in court. Mr. Coates says, he will not trust the papers, in the hands of any one, except himself, until the papers of the Secretary of the commonwealth, are removed to Harrisburg,

I am, very respectfully
James Mease

One wonders whether Dr. Mease was in error in writing that Coates had brought over the Charter in 1810 rather than on his first trip. At all events, it is established that a Charter was brought by Coates from England.

The agent's willingness to deposit the Charter with the state is somewhat explained by the following letter:

Joseph Reed Esq.

Dear Sir.

As I have no receipt for the Charter (and want none) it would be agreeable to me that it should be publickly known to have been


lately in possession of one of the proprietaries of Pennsylvania; but that not being recorded it is now voluntarily sent for the purpose of being deposited among the archives of the State. It will also be necessary to enable the Penn family and others to give in evidence the printed copy prefixed to the Laws of Pennsylvania; but previous to this an examination of the correctness of that copy should be made.

Yours respectfully
John R. Coates

January 31, 1812.

Thus the Charter passed into public hands. In a republished edition of the *Laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania*, which appeared in 1812, is found the text of the document, “Compared with and corrected by the original Charter, deposited in the office of the secretary of the commonwealth. February 21, 1812.” Governor Snyder formally announced the deposit to the Senate and the House on March 20, 1812.

There seems to have been no question at this early time as to its originality. Coates certainly deemed it authentic and specifically requested the privilege when he made the deposit of being able to withdraw it if “the production of the original document in court” should be required. There was no questioning of the Charter by the public officials who, by an act of March 31, 1823, made its exemplification evidence in courts of justice. A few years later, in 1829, John Cadwalader, Pennsylvania counsel for the Penn family, drew up an “Abstract of the General Title of the Representatives of the late Proprietaries of Pennsylvania.” Naturally, the Charter was the cornerstone of the title, and in Cadwalader’s hand is this note: “The origl. Charter is in the Office of the Secy of the Commonwealth where it was deposited 21 Feby 1812.”

This statement would seem to invalidate Rawle’s suspicion that Cadwalader had sent the original to York in 1844, where it had disappeared. If Cadwalader himself acknowledged the Commonwealth to be the owner of the document, it would not have been in his custody.

30 *PMHB*, XXIII (1899), 61.
in 1844. Undoubtedly an authenticated copy was the cause of Rawle's confusion. We can thus dispose of the third argument listed at the beginning of this article.\footnote{On the basis of the Hambly letter of 1844, Rawle assumed that the Charter had never been turned over to the state in 1812. We have ample proof, however, that it did come into the possession of the state in that year. Mention of its being in the custody of the Secretary of the Commonwealth in 1837 and 1850 is to be found in this article.}

If additional proof is required to show that the Charter which Coates brought from England was the original copy it can be found in the Recollections of John Jay Smith. Smith wrote of his 1845 visit to Stoke Park that few Pennsylvanians had called there "since the disastrous agent John R. Coates, had been there received. He brought away the charters, etc. from King Charles, and bestowed them at Harrisburg, after having given a receipt which I have seen, to return them to the owners."\footnote{Recollections of John Jay Smith (Philadelphia, 1892), 178.}

For the first twenty-five years of its custody at Harrisburg the Charter was probably not often exhibited, but was kept folded up in its original manner in some safe place by the Secretary of the Commonwealth. In 1837, however, this officer was directed that "the original charter of Pennsylvania—that of Charles II to William Penn" should be "framed, covered with glass, and placed in his office for the inspection of visitors."\footnote{Hampton Carson, A History of The Historical Society of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia, 1940) I, 165.} "This venerable document which is in the office of the Secretary of the Commonwealth," wrote Samuel Hazard in 1850, "is now framed and hung up."\footnote{Hazard, 499–500.}

In 1878, facsimile engravings of its four sheets were published in the Pennsylvania Archives, Second Series, volume VII, "from the Original on file in the Office of the Secretary of the Commonwealth."\footnote{Pennsylvania Archives, Second Series, VII, Appendix.} Volume VIII bears as its frontispiece what purports to be a "Fac-simile of the remaining portion of the waxen seal attached to the Charter of the Province of Pennsylvania granted by Charles II to William Penn." As Rawle pointed out, however, the seal depicted is not the Great Seal of England, but the Great Seal of the Province of New York during the reign of George II. When questioned about this, John Blair Linn, one of the editors of the Archives, denied re-
sponsibility. This action, in effect, discloses that an error had been made, that a wrong seal was mistakenly used for the illustration. Very likely the Great Seal had become detached from the Charter prior to this time. During 1878, Linn served as Secretary of the Commonwealth and was thus the official custodian of the Charter; he should have known the appearance of the Seal if it still existed.36

An examination of the Charter as it appears today finds it to be contained on four large sheets of parchment. All four sheets are beautifully decorated and lettered37; the first, however, is the most impressive since it contains the portrait of the King partially enclosed in the letter C of his name at the upper left-hand corner. This first sheet has suffered far more severely than the others. Part of its text is lost where creases made by folding the document into a compact unit have been broken through.

The edges of all the sheets appear to have been trimmed. This is especially noticeable at the bottom edge which has been drastically cut. Originally a triangular pattern of neatly bored holes pierced all four sheets at the middle of the bottom edge. Through these holes were passed the cords to the ends of which was affixed the Great Seal. The Great Seal is gone, the cords are gone, and even some of the holes have been removed by slicing off the bottom margin of the Charter. Thus, on the first sheet all are missing, while on the third only the top hole remains. This indicates that at one time, the Charter was trimmed to fit some sort of display case, perhaps the case made in 1837. No doubt it was at this time that the Great Seal was cut off the document in order to allow its four sheets to be separated for exhibition. The Seal itself is missing as the result of this unfortunate action.

The borders of all the sheets are marred by numerous nail or tack holes, mute testimony that the Charter has been tacked up on more than one occasion.

When the separate sheets composing the Charter were originally bound together, they were arranged in inverse order; the sheet which contained the beginning of the Charter lay on the bottom and the

37 The decorations on the top center margins of the second, third, and fourth sheets were not completed.
sheet with the ending and the statement "By Writt of Privy Seale" lay on top. Consequently, the creases showing the folds of the final sheet are sharp and thin, while the creases on the first sheet are wide and soft. Having borne all the brunt as the outside envelope, the first sheet is of a much darker color and is the only sheet that contains badly damaged places. In addition, endorsements are to be found on the reverse of the first sheet. They are four in number. The top one simply gives the date of the Charter in a somewhat spidery writing. Under this is to be found in a handsome, stylized hand a five-word phrase of which only the three central words, "in and by," are unmistakable. Somewhat below these words, in the same hand, is the numeral eleven, or two, if interpreted as a Roman numeral. At the bottom of what was the top facing of the document when completely folded, is the name "Paris" in Fernando John Paris' writing.

Only one vestige of the Great Seal is to be found by a study of the document—excepting, of course, the triangular pattern of holes which were bored for the cords. On the surface of the fourth and final sheet, which actually was the top sheet by the arrangement mentioned, are found circular marks. It was customary to protect the seal by enclosing it in a closely fitting metal box, known as a "skippet" or "fender." At one time, the custodian of the Charter placed this box on the lower part of the face of the document and then folded the upper part over on top of it. Rustlike discolorations outlining the circular shape of the "skippet" appear at top and bottom of the sheet as a result of this unusual encasing of the Great Seal within the Charter itself.

So far nothing has been mentioned in its appearance which would make one doubt its originality, but now we come to the crux of the problem. At the bottom left-hand corner on the face of the final sheet is to be found an endorsement. This has been transcribed as "XXVIJ: die Janry 1682 Fir L John Shaler Chev". The exact meaning of this mystic scribble no one sought to explain, but the date spoke for itself. This was taken as evidence that the Charter was simply a certified copy made some time after the original.

As stated earlier, several details had still to be taken care of after
the Charter had been engrossed and before it could be turned over
to William Penn. It had to be copied out in the Enrolment Books of
the Office of the Auditors of the Land Revenue. When this had been
accomplished, an official of that office endorsed the copy in the En-
Shales Aud[itorem].” John Shales was one of the Exchequer Aud-
tors or Auditors of the Land Revenue.

A re-examination of the difficult writing on the Harrisburg
Charter discloses that its endorsement has not only never been
understood, but also has never been correctly transcribed. It should
properly read “xxvij mo die Junii 1682 Irr[otulatur] p[er] John Shales
Aud[itorem],” i.e., “27 June 1682 enrolled by John Shales Auditor.”
This note, which perfectly complements the note in the Enrolment
Book was made by John Shales to indicate that the patent had been
duly recorded in his department. Far from furnishing proof that the
Harrisburg Charter is not the original, this note may be taken as
conclusive evidence that that document is the original patent. An
interval of a year or more between the date of the granting of a
patent and the date of its enrollment by the Auditors of the Land
Revenue was not unusual.

Finally, let us answer the question, “Where is The Original of the
Charter of Charles The Second To William Penn For The Province
of Pennsylvania?” by stating that the Charter is at Harrisburg in
the custody of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and has been
there since 1812.

Philadelphia

Nicholas B. Wainwright

39 Photostatic copy, Enrolment Books of the Office of the Auditors of the Land Revenue
(Public Record Office, L.R. 1/117, Part 1, ff. 4-8).