

FURTHER REMARKS ON SOME OF THE
ANCIENT INNS OF SOUTHWARK.

By W. H. HART, Esq., F.S.A.

THE following brief remarks are intended as a supplement to the valuable and interesting paper on some of the ancient inns of Southwark, by our late lamented friend and coadjutor, G. R. Corner, Esq.

They are based upon certain Records and State Papers which have recently passed through my hands, and I have thought it desirable that the information which these documents afford should be made available to the readers of the Collections of this Society. The interest attaching to the subject itself I need not insist on, for it must be acknowledged by all who have had the advantage of perusing Mr. Corner's paper.

The first document to be noticed is a petition from the inhabitants of the borough of Southwark, in the year 1619, against the opening of a certain road, or way, leading out of Southwark to two newly-erected inns on Bankside, which, as they alleged, was very prejudicial to the Borough, as it consisted principally of innkeepers, whose custom was so much injured thereby, that immediate ruin stared them in the face, unless the road to these two new inns was immediately closed up.

The petition, as will be seen, was presented to the Lord Mayor and Aldermen, who, in a letter dated March 16th, 1619, transmitted it to the Lords of the Privy Council, as the following documents show :—

Our duties to your Lordships most humbly remembered, the petition inclosed was delivered unto us by the inhabitantes of the Burrough of Southwarke, freemen of the Cittie of London, complayning that the

said Burrough doth suffer muche prejudice by reason of a way of sufferance leading out of Southwarke over the Citties landes unto twoe newe erected Innes upon the Bancke side, where never none formerlie was, and the same way heretofore being thought by us to bee verie inconvenient, and of dangerous use for the redy escape of malefactors out of the Cittie into Kent and Surrey, as also very incommodious and prejudiciall to all the Inkeepers and tradesmen of the Burroughe of Southwarke and upon London Bridge, wee caused yt to be barred up, but in Aprill last, (upon the petition of the said twoe Inkeepers and some fewe others exhibited to your Lordships) wee were required by your Lordships letters to lay the way open againe, untill ether by a legall course, yt shoulde be judged by lawe, or cause shewed to your Lordships to the contrary.

Wee have thought good therefore humbly to recomende unto your good Lordships the humble petition of the Inhabitants of the Burroughe of Southwarke, as also their allegacions inclosed therein, against ye sufferance and inconveniency of the saide way, humbly beseeching your Lordships to take them into your honorable consideracions, and to sett downe suche order therein as in your wisdomes shalbee thought meete.

And so wee humble take our leave and allwaies rest

xvi^o die Marcii 1618.

Your Lordships most humble

SEBASTIAN HARVYE Maior.

Martin Lumley

Edward Barkham

Thomas Bennett

William Gore

Alexander Prescottt

Thomas Lowe

John Gore

Tho. Benet junio^r

Thomas Myddelton

Allin Cotton

Henrye Jay

John Jolles

Richard Pern

Pe. Proby

Jhon Leman

William Cokayne

Stephen Soame

(Addressed)

To the right honorable the Lordes and others of
his Majesties most honorable Previe Councell.

First the sufferance of that way ys a ready meanes for suche as robb and steale, or committ anie mischefe or disorder on the cittie syde to escape to those Innes, as fitt receptacles for them att all howers in the nyghte, where there horses are suddenlie reddie to convey them into Kente or Surrey, and in lyke maner from that syde into the Cittie, (noe officers, nor order of justice beinge there so redy to impeache them in their escapes as in those Innes which are within the bodye and government of the Burroughe).

Secondlie the Burroughe of Southwarke consisting cheiflye of Inkeepers, and being a place of greate receyte of people and trade from diverse Sheires of the Realme, and in former times having been able to pay more subsodie to the Kinges and Queenes of the Realme than anie cittie within the kingdom (London excepted) by the meanes of theis twoe newe Innes (latelie builte on the Bancksyde wher never none formerlie was) ys so muche prejudiced (being bereaved of their ordinarie proffitt and custome, which formerlie they had before those twoe pryvat Innes were erected) that in a verie shorte tyme (if that way be suffered

to lye open for all passengers, which lyke a bye streame, draweth from the mayne most parte of the country people which were wonte to lodge in ye Burrough) all the Inkeepers in Southwarke, which are []¹ in number, must be forced to shutt upp their doares.

Thirdlie all trades men both in the Burrough and upon London Bridge, which have their greatest utterance of their wares, in the tearme tyme, by suche as lodge and guest in the commen innes in Southwarke, will suffer greate prejudice in their trades by the meanes of theis two by Innes, which drawe the people by that way out of the Burrough to the manifest decay of ye Burrough Innes.

Lastlie the Inkeepers and trades men (which live by the helpe of one an other) are the ablest persons in that place, both for the payment of subsidie and fifteenes to his Majestie, and other publike services, as also for the reliefe of a multitude of poore people within the Burrough, and therefore your petitioners hope that their lordships will not thinke it reasonable that twoe privat men be suffered (for their owne particuler) to drawe all the proffitt and benefitt, both from the Burrough of Southwarke and London Bridge, and consequentlie to bereave so manie poore people of their maintenaunce, by the decay of the best sorte of dwellers in y^t place.

May it therefore please your good Lordship and worships to take theis thinges into your consideracion, and to be a meane to the right honorable the lordes of his Majestys most honorable Previe Councell, that the said privat way may bee barred upp, (being made over the Citties landes and generally so hurtfull and inconvenient to so manie citizens) untill those twoe privat persons, that ar most interested therein shall upon triall, by course of lawe, prove it to bee a comon way.

And the shall pray, &c.²

The result of this petition I have not been able to discover, neither can I at present identify the roadway complained of, which I should much like to have done. It is, doubtless, represented by one of the numerous outlets from the Borough westward, but which one I cannot say with any certainty.

And now with regard to the White Lion mentioned by Mr. Corner (p. 74). I mean, not the White Lion stated to have been opposite to St. Saviour's Church, but that White Lion which was used as a gaol, and was also, locally, the predecessor of the Marshalsea prison.

Several petitions of prisoners confined there are preserved among the State Papers, as well as correspond-

¹ Blank in MS.

² State Papers, Dom. James I. vol. 107.

ence on the same subject; the most important of them I here print at length.

The first is a letter from Secretary Conway to the Lord Chief Justice:—

23 Oct 1628.

My good Lord

His Majestie hath bene informed that one William Hare hath very dangerously wounded Matthew Graham, for which fact he is now prisoner in the White Lyon. And because Graham is said to be in much danger of his life, and that the attempt upon him was soe fowle as it could not be but with a murtherous intent.

His Majestie's pleasure is that your Lordship take particular notice of it, and give order that Hare be kept safe prisoner and not bayled but upon very good security to be forthcoming, and to answer the fact upon such actions as shalbe laid against him, whether Graham live or dye.

Yor Lordships.¹

To the Kings most Excelent Majestie.

The humble peticon of James Foster a convict prisoner in the Gaole of the White Lyon in Southwark in the Countie of Surrey.

Most humblie sheweth, That the petitioner comeinge up to London aboute some suites in lawe hee hath for land hee is intituled unto in Comberland, for which hee should have a triall theis Summer Assizes att Carlile, and haveing dispatched his busines for the same, was aboute 6 weekes past, travaileinge on foote towards Croyden, and beinge upon the waie was overtaken by a Gentleman on horseback, one whome your petitioner had never seene before. This straunger desired your petitioner to ride and himselfe would goe a while on foote, being (as hee said) wearie with rideinge. The petitioner presentlie takeing it as a curtesie did gett up upon his horse, and haveinge not ridden above halfe a mile a companie of men mett him and challenged the horse to bee stollen, whereupon the straunger immediatelie drewe his sworde, lefte his cloake, and fledd into a wood, whome they pursued but could not take him. The petitioner knoweing his innocencie never offered to resist, but stood by it, and was apprehended and sent to prison, and for the same arraigned att the Assizes att Croyden, and upon his arraignment was by the jurie att the first twice acquitted, yett haveing heavie enemies, meanes was made that they were sent againe from the barre and comeinge up the third time they gave him up guiltie; but such was the clemencie of the Reverend Judges, thinckinge the petitioner to have some hard measure that they vouchsafed to graunte him a reprieve.

¹ Dom. Charles I. vol. 119.

The petitioner haveing all his time lived in honest fame and credit and never before taxed for anie such fact, and being farre from home and haveinge a wife and 6 children, most of them verie small, readie to famish for want of such reliefe and comfort as hee should yeild them; most humblie beseecheth your sacred Majestie (in tender comiseracion of his greate distresse and miserie soe unfortunatelie happened unto him) to bee pleased out of your princelie grace and pitie to graunte your petitioners pardon.

And (accordinge to his bounden duetie) hee shall daylie praie for your Majesties longe and happie reigne.¹

To the Kings most excellent Majestie.

The humble petition of Sarah Lambert

Humbly sheweth

That your petitioner being charged with the picking of a lock of one Elizabeth Archand and taking out of her chest 18s. in money and for stealing certaine things from one Nicholas Paine, was for the same arraigned, convicted, and condemned to dye, but by your Majestys princely clemencie (her offence being of a trivial nature) shee was reprieved from execucion, ever since when shee hath continued in the Gaole of the White Lyon in greate miserie being soe poore that shee is altogether unable to procure your Majesty's royall pardon or her release but is likely miserably to perish unles your Majesty's gracious favour bee to her extended. Forasmuch therefore as your Majestie hath bene pleased to give order to your Attorney Generall for drawing upp a pardon for all such condemned persons as are capable of your Majestie's mercie.

Shee most humbly beseecheth your Majestie (even for Christ Jesus sake and out of your accustomed princely clemencie) to bee graciously pleased to give order to your Attorney Generall to incert her (amongst others) into your said royall pardon.

And (as in dutie bound) shee will praie, &c.

This petition was presented in December, 1629, and it was referred to the Attorney-General to take order that her name might be inserted in the pardon alluded to.²

To the right honorable the Lordes and others of his Majesty's most honorable Privey Counsell.

The humble petition of Thomas Cooke of the parish of St George in the Burroughe of Southwark

Humbly sheweth, That whereas Lewis Hewes a non conformed minister was aboute 5 yeares since complained of by your petitioner

¹ Domestic, Charles I. vol. 147. This petition is dated July, 1629.

² Domestic, Charles I. vol. 153.

(being then one of the Churchwardens of the said parish) unto the Right Reverend Father in God the Lord Bishop of Winchester, whose lordship upon conference with the said Hewes dismissed him of his place of preaching in the Gaole of the White Lyon, whereupon the said Hewes hath ever since unjustlie and maliciouslie persecuted your petitioner in severall courtes of justice for felonie and other supposed misdemeanours whereof he is acquitted, and Hewes and one other were in due time convict in his Majesty's honorable Courte of Kings Bench for conspiracie against your petitioner, and for some defect in the indictment, judgement thereupon beinge respited, in Aprill last hee presented a petition to this Honorable Boarde containeing the former supposed misdemeanours, upon which it was ordered by your Lordships as by the order hereunto annexed appeareth, since which time the said Hewes (not being able to moderate his malice) hath presumed to present to your Lordships another petition of the same supposed misdemeanours which by this Honorable Board was referred to Mr Attorney Generall to consider of, who haveinge made certificate thereupon, the said Hewes detaineth the said certificate from this Honorable Boarde and is readie to present another petition to your Lordships.

In consideracion of the premisses and for that it is well knownen that your petitioner is a subsidie man, and liveth in good reputacion in his countrey, It maie please your Lordships to take such order with the said Hewes for theis his unjust vexacions and his clamorous and scandalous courses against your petitioner, as to your good Lordships in your grave wisdomes shall seeme meete.

And your petitioner shall ever praie, &c.

Upon this petition it was ordered by the Council, on the 31st October, 1633, that in case Hughes detained the certificate of the Attorney-General as alleged, and did not deliver in the same by the 8th November, he should stand committed to the Fleet.¹

On the 22nd of June, 1662, Secretary Nicholas addressed a letter to the Justices of Peace for the county of Surrey, in which he recommended Stephen Harris (who, when constable of St. Thomas's parish, Southwark, did acceptable service in apprehending Hugh Peters, &c.), as a fit person for keeper of the White Lion prison, Southwark, in case of the removal of William Arthur, whose former carriage, if it be as reported, would render it unsafe longer to continue him.

¹ Domestic, Charles I. vol. 248.

Shortly after this Harris himself addresses a petition to the king on the same subject, thus:—

To the Kings most excellent Majestie.

The humble petition of Stephen Harris

Most humbly sheweth,

That your petitioner did attend on one of your Majesties Messengers at the apprehending of Hugh Peters at such time as your petitioner was constable, and since hath severall times been active and stirring in the discovery of the secretts of your Majesties enemyes, apprehending some 40 or 50 in a day as is well knowne to his Grace the Duke of Albemarle and some others of your Majesties most honorable Privy Councill, for which service done to your Majestie your petitioner hath quite lost his trade, living in the Burrough of Southwarke amongst the most numerous factious people of your Majestie's kingdome of England, and consequently ruyned himselfe by being mark't out by them as a Saul or persecutor of the people as they terme him.

Now forasmuch may it please your Majestie as [William] Arthur keeper of the White Lyon prison, for some grand misdemeanours, is to be turn'd out of his said place, and for that your petitioner hath applied himselfe to Sir Nicholas Stanton, Sheriffe of the County of Surrey, for conferring the said place on your petitioner who hath promised the same, provided your petitioner can obtaine your Majestie's letter to that effect.

Your petitioner therefore most humbly prayes your sacred Majestie that you would be graciously pleased to grant him your letter recommendatory or order to the said Sheriffe for his conferring on your petitioner the said place of Keeper of the White Lyon Prison, in the roome and place of the said [William] Arthur.

And as in duty bound your petitioner shall pray, &c.

Annexed to this petition is a certificate by Sir Edward Nicholas and three other justices of Southwark, dated November 23rd, 1662, in favour of Harris; and on the 29th of the same month the King writes to the Sheriff of Surrey commending the appointment of Harris for his diligence, activity, and loyalty.¹ On January 29th, 1663, a warrant was issued to the chief keeper of the White Lion prison, Southwark, to discharge Arthur Fisher and forty-six other Quakers, against whom there is no charge but their meeting.²

Harris seems to have associated with himself a partner

¹ Domestic, Charles II. vol. 63.

² Domestic, Charles II. vol. 67.

in managing the affairs of the prison, one Joseph Hall, who, from his negligence and wrongful acts in the discharge of his office, soon fell into disgrace, as the following information shows :—

An Information against Joseph Hall.

Whereas Thomas Moore, M^r Fisher, M^r Breckstocke, and M^r Fuce, Quackers, ware committed too the Whight Lion in Southwarke beeing the countey prison for that countey for unlawfull meeting thay ware foarthwith discharged ye sam night by the sayd Hall and neaver went intoo prison at all neather ware thay there last night beeing the 25 off October 1663.

Sabbath day beeing the 4 of October 1663 ye prison beeing searcht by a mesinger a sarvant too the king's majestie thare was then an unlawfull meetinge off ye Quackers 'assembled toogether at thare unlawfull exersis that cam as well from all parts of London as them off the prison that then ware prisinors.

Lickwis the last Sabbath day beeing the 25 off October thee meantim that cunstable and other the kings ofisers ware surprisinge thare meetings that ware then met toogether in a tumultious maner thare was all the afternone a meetinge in ye prison off many scoares.

One thinge moore M^r Harris and another hearinge off a rebelios parson that is a reabill too ye kings majestie went expecttinge too tacke him hee hearinge off it went intoo ye prisone and tooald the factitious people that his partnor woas gon a man cathin (man-catching) too mack him bee hated for doeinge ye kinges sarvis.¹

Here follows a curious petition of a Quaker, one George Whitehead, some time a prisoner in the White Lion :—

Friend

These things I thought meet to signifye to thee which thou art desired to read over, and that thou mayest shew this to the Kinge, viz :—

I being here a prisoner at the White Lyon in Southwarke with many more upon the account of meeting (as our usuall manner hath been) in the worship of God and being sentenced upon the laite Act for being at a seditious conventicle (as was pretended against us) by three justices (soe called) viz :—John Bromfelde, John Lenthall and George Moore who have sentenced mee with the rest of us (whome they committed upon the same Accounte) to suffer three moneths imprisonment which is the utmost (by the Act) for the first offence though the transgression (or fact) which ye Act reaches was not proved against us nor any evill or unlawfull act or sedition wherby to make our meeting unlawfull, as

¹ This document is undated, but it may with certainty be referred to the 26th October, 1663.—Domestic, Charles II. vol. 82.

was toulde the said justices ; yet notwithstanding the rigour of the law in this case would not serve their turne but the said George Moore threatened mee (when he was upon the Bench) not onely with imprisonment, but with removeinge to another place ; pretending a suspicion against mee ; and allsoe the Clerke (that belongs to one of the justices) asked mee if it was not my name (or if it was not I) that was mentioned in the proclamation for the apprehending some plotters, &c., which I knew nothing of, as I toulde them ; Howbeit (on the third day of this week) I was had out of the Goale before John Lenthall (at the same time that there was a man before him that was committed for treason as they said), and one whose name they say is John Pebles a lawyer, being present who appeared in enmitty against mee though a man unknowne to mee, and after some words they brought mee allsoe (when that man accused of treason was brought) to White-Hall and John Lenthall allsoe went thither at that time, and the said John Pebles would have out-faced mee as if my name was not Whitehead but would have fastened one of their names upon mee that is mencioned in the proclamation amonge those y^t are accused for plotters &c. And after I was kept sometime at Whitehall waiting to be called in question (or to be had) before thee or ye Kinge (which I was not) I was returned back againe to prison ; the said John Pebles telling the keeper as I was comeing away, that the Secretary (who I suppose to be thyselve) had ordered, that he should not discharge mee till he had further order from him (or to y^t effect).

Now therfore such endeavours being used against mee to render mee both suspitious and guilty in such a high nature, I desire that I may come before the Kinge and the rest of you to whome I have been represented in this nature (if any behinde my back have accused mee to thee or any of you) together with my accusers or such as pretend suspition against me, that wee may appeare face to face before you ; and I may know what can be said or pretended against mee ; and be heard to answer for myselfe, for if it be not innough that I undergoe the severity of the law upon which I was committed but must be detained upon thy order or not discharged without order from thee, It is but reasonable that I shoulde know ye cause, and not be condemned by any nor any pretence received against mee without being heard ; for the penaltye that I (and the rest of us here) suffer under is severe enough, being both the utmost of the law (for the first offence) which wee are supposed offenders of and in a degree in order to banishment, as allsoe wee are in a noysome stincking prison which is much filled with prisoners of one sorte and other, wherin wee have mett with hard usage since wee came and in which many of our friends have heretofore lost their lives thorow their great suffering.

These things consider of ; and let mee not be detained
by thy order without a cause.

White Lyon prison
the 14th of ye 5th moneth, 1664.

GEORGE WHITEHEAD.

(Endorsed)

For the Kings Secretary viz Secretarie Bennet.¹

¹ Domestic, Charles II. vol. 100.

On the 11th of November, 1664, the King addressed a letter to Sir William Humble, High Sheriff of Surrey, recommending John Wickham for the place of keeper of the White Lion prison, Southwark, which would soon be void by removal of Joseph Hall, for want of care and faithfulness in a place of public trust.¹

The following examination of William Ashenhurst, a prisoner in the White Lion, taken on the 19th March, 1665, is the last of these documents that I have as yet been able to discover:—

Sunday 19 of March.

Examination of the prisoner in the White Lyon.

He saith that there is in the prison frequent meetings of Anabaptists and to the number of 40 or 50 persons. He remembers that some of them were his judges and condemned him when he was in Sir George Booth's business.

He saith he is very well assured they have a chamber allotted them for the which they pay a considerable rent.

He hath seen them come late at night and goe out very early in the morning; there was a company of them the Sunday before the last 'sises, and this prisoner looking throw the keyhole saw 7 or 8 paire of pockett pistols lying upon the table, and observed them very earnest in their discourse, and overheard them say that something of great concernment was to be done in Aprill next.

And he sayes he should have discovered more of their proceedings but that one of them comming to the doore and seeing him there, asked him what busines he had there, and so was forced to leave them.

He saith he hath bin a prisoner there about 7 moneths, in all which time he hath observed them to meet constantly, and which he sayes he can prove by severall persons, and he saith their pretence of coming is to see some of their bretheren which are in this prison.

(Addressed)

For Joseph Williamson, esq^r, these.

(Endorsed)

Ashenhurst's examination.²

We will now proceed to trace the territorial history of the White Lion from the year 1654 to 1798, during which period its different devolutions I have been able to discover without a break:—

By an indenture dated the 13th August, 1654, made

¹ State Papers, Charles II. Entry Book, 17, p. 68.

² Domestic, Charles II. vol. 115.

between John Shawe, of London, merchant, and Sarah his wife, Anne Rich, of the parish of St. George the Martyr, in Southwark, widow, and Thomas Rich, her son, of Leigh, in the county of Kent, yeoman, of the one part, and Benjamin Weston, of Walton-upon-Thames, esquire, Sir Thomas Evelyn, of Long Ditton, knight, William Hinde, of Lambeth, esquire, Edward Knipe, of Thames Ditton, esquire, John Scott, of Camberwell, esquire, George Chute, of Lambeth, esquire, Christopher Buckle, of Banstead, esquire, John Evelyn, of Godstone, esquire, John Carrell, of Tangley, esquire, Robert Holman, of Blechingly, esquire, John Goodwin, of Blechingly, esquire, Robert Wood, of Kingston, esquire, Francis Drake, of Walton-upon-Thames, esquire, James Burton, of Newington, esquire, John Evershead, of Ockley, gentleman, Anthony Hilder, of Great Bookham, gentleman, John Boys, of Nutfield, gentleman, Erasmus Snelling, of Southwark, gentleman, Simon Howe, of Petersham, gentleman, Thomas Rollinson, of the Clink, gentleman, and William Comber, of Dorking, gentleman, of the other part; reciting that by an Act of Parliament intituled an Act touching a common Gaol and House of Correction for the County of Surrey, made and dated the 18th day of April, 1651, it was enacted that the Commissioners therein specified should have full power to assess, tax, levy, and collect on the inhabitants, freeholders, and others of the county of Surrey, the sum of £1,200, for purchasing any house, &c., fit or convenient to make a common gaol and house of correction; and that Benjamin Weston and the others were nominated trustees for the purchase of such gaol; it was witnessed that in consideration of the sum of £361. 3s. paid to John Shawe and Sarah his wife, and of 5 shillings to Anne Rich, and £50 to Thomas Rich, the said John Shawe and Sarah his wife, Anne Rich and Thomas Rich, have granted, bargained, &c., unto the said Benjamin Weston, and the other trustees, their heirs and assigns, for ever, All that capital messuage or tenement commonly called or known by the name of the White Lyon; and also all that messuage or tenement adjoining called or known by the

name of the House of Correction, then or late in the tenure and occupation of the said Anne Rich, her assignee or assigns; and all tenements, houses, &c., to the said two messuages belonging, with all their appurtenances, situate and being on the east side of the High Street of the borough of Southwark, in the parish of St. George the Martyr, in Southwark aforesaid; and also all that piece or parcel of land with the appurtenances, late in the tenure or occupation of one Henry Harris, and then in the occupation of the said Anne Rich, her assignee or assigns, containing by estimation one acre, more or less, and commonly called or known by the name of the White Lyon acre, lying and being in the fields called St. George's Fields, in the parish of St. George the Martyr aforesaid, near to the way there leading from Blackman Street to the Bankside; to hold the same unto the said Benjamin Weston, &c. &c., their heirs and assigns, for ever, upon trust that the same should from thenceforth for ever be used and employed for a common gaol and house of correction for the county of Surrey.¹

By indenture of bargain and sale, dated February 7th, 1693, and made between the aforesaid Christopher Buckle, by the name and addition of Sir Christopher Buckle, of Borough, in the parish of Banstead, knight (being the only surviving trustee named in the last-mentioned indenture), of the one part, and Sir Francis Vincent, of Stoke Dawborne, baronet, Henry St. John, of Battersea, esquire, and divers other gentlemen therein named, inhabitants within the county of Surrey, of the other part, the premises in question were conveyed to Sir Francis Vincent, &c. &c., as new trustees, upon the same trusts as before.²

By another indenture of bargain and sale, dated June 1, 1718, made between the said Henry St. John, by the name and title of the Right Honourable Henry Lord Viscount St. John, Baron of Battersea, and Sir Francis

¹ This deed was inrolled in Chancery on the 30th November, 1654 (Close Roll, 1654, part 41, No. 6).

² This deed was inrolled in Chancery on the 24th May following (Close Roll, 6 W. & M. part 1, No. 18).

Vincent, Edward Thurland, Denzell Onslow, Nicholas Carew, Lancelot Lee, and Henry Byne, being the surviving trustees of the last-mentioned indenture, of the one part, and John Fulham, of Compton, esquire, Sir John Evelyn, of Wootton, baronet, Sir Nicholas Carew, of Beddington, baronet, Sir William Scawen, of Carshalton, knight, Sir William Jolliffe, of Ewell, knight, Sir Thomas Scawen, of Banstead, knight, Sir James Clarke, of Moulsey, knight, Edward Nicholas, of Horseley, esquire, William Clayton, of Godstone, esquire, Thomas Broderick, of Pepperharrow, esquire, George Ballard, of Leatherhead, esquire, George Evelyn, of Godstone, esquire, Michael Harvey, of Comb, esquire, Arthur Onslow, of the Middle Temple, London, esquire, Robert Douglas, of Chertsey, esquire, Paul Dockminique, of Gatton, esquire, William Draper, of Croydon, esquire, John Edwards, of Epsom, esquire, Gilbert Douglas, of Chertsey, esquire, Richard Clifton, of Womersh, esquire, Morgan Randall, of Chilworth, esquire, William Newland, of Gatton, esquire, John Letten, of Esher, esquire, and John Burchett, of Kingston-upon-Thames, esquire, of the other part, as trustees for and on behalf of the inhabitants of the county of Surrey, the premises were again conveyed to the said John Fulham and others, upon similar trusts.

By another indenture dated February 26th, 1735, made between the Right Honourable Henry Lord Viscount St. John, Baron of Battersea, of the one part, and the Right Honourable Arthur Onslow, esquire, Speaker of the House of Commons, the Honourable Richard Onslow, esquire, only son and heir-apparent of the Right Honourable the Lord Onslow, Sir William Clayton, of Godstone, baronet, Sir John Lade, of Southwark, baronet, Sir More Molyneux, of Loseley, knight, John Lant, Daniel Pettward, and Percival Lewis, of Putney, esquires, Charles Dockminique, of Gatton, esquire, William Belitha and Nicholas Hardinge the younger, of Kingston, esquires, Richard Pinnell and John Mann, of Tooting, esquires, Charles Selwyn, of Richmond, esquire, Joshua Smith, Robert Paul, Charles Carkesse, of Battersea, esquires,

Samuel Atkinson, Richard Jervoise, and John Heathfield, of Croydon, esquires, of the other part, after reciting the before-mentioned indentures of August 13th, 1654, and February 7th, 1693, and that all the trustees named in the deed of 1693, except Lord Viscount St. John, were dead; it was witnessed that in pursuance of an order of session for that purpose made on the 13th January then last, Lord Viscount St. John granted, bargained, &c., to the said Arthur Onslow, and the other trustees, all the aforesaid premises, upon the same trusts as before.

By an indenture dated the 17th day of August, 1798, and made between the Right Honourable George Lord Onslow and Cranley, Lord Lieutenant and Custos Rotulorum of the county of Surrey, the Right Honourable George Evelyn Leslie, of Dorking, commonly called Lord Leslie, the Right Honourable William Russell, of Streatham, commonly called Lord William Russell, and knight of the shire of the said county, the Right Honourable William Lord Grantley, Baron of Grantley, in the county of York, and Sir John Frederick, of Burwood Park, baronet, one of the knights of the shire for the said county, being five acting justices of the peace of the county of Surrey, of the one part, and his Grace the Most Noble John Frederick, Duke of Dorset, Lord Steward of His Majesty's household, and Sir James Burgess, baronet, Knight Marshal of the ancient Court of the Marshalsea of the said household, and one of the judges of the Court of the King's Palace of Westminster, and William Cruchley, of Finchley Lodge, in the county of Middlesex, esquire, Deputy Prothonotary of the said court, trustees named by and on behalf of His Majesty, of the other part; reciting that by an Act of Parliament passed in the 31st year of George III., intituled "An Act for building a New Common Gaol and Sessions House, with accommodations thereto, for the county of Surrey, and for disposing of the present county gaol and the ground thereto belonging," it was enacted that the justices of the peace for the county might cause the present gaol, situate in the parish of St. George, South-

wark (which was thereby declared, and the ground and soil thereof, to be vested in them for that purpose) to be taken down, and to sell the ground, and the money arising thereby to apply towards the expenses of building and finishing a new gaol and Session House; it was witnessed that in consideration of £4,000, the said George Lord Onslow, &c., granted, bargained, &c., to the Duke of Dorset, &c., and their heirs, all that piece or parcel of ground whereon lately stood a capital messuage or tenement, commonly called or known by the name of the White Lion, and also a messuage or tenement then adjoining thereto, and called or known by the name of the House of Correction, formerly in the tenure or occupation of Ann Rich, her assignee or assigns, and all tenements, &c., situate and being on the east side of the High Street of the borough of Southwark, and lately used and employed as a common gaol and house of correction for the county of Surrey; to hold the same in trust for his Majesty, his heirs and successors, for ever.¹

¹ This deed was inrolled in Chancery Dec. 14, 1798.