

Branch of the Scheme. It is hoped that many other such deeds will in time be deposited instead of being destroyed, as was the common lot of many old documents in the past. The Hon. Secretaries will also be glad to hear of old title-deeds, rolls and illustrations, or measured drawings of buildings architecturally or historically interesting in private keeping, so that a register of such deeds and illustrations can be made.

The Benedictine Priory of St. Mary Magdalene, Ankerwyke, Bucks

By FREDERIC TURNER.

Ankerwyke is one of the many religious houses whose muniments, tossed aside at the 'Suppression,' have almost entirely disappeared. Hearne, writing in 1732, mentions a cartulary of the house as being then in possession of Philip Harcourt, but this too has vanished; all we can learn of the little community must be gleaned from the Bishop's Registers, the Public Records, wills and lawsuits.

The account of the house given in the Victoria History of Bucks is very much condensed, merely giving the main facts, but omitting many important details which throw considerable light upon the history of the house. It certainly seems worth while to piece together the scattered references for the sake of the information they give of life in a mediaeval nunnery.¹ Ankerwyke was one of the numerous religious houses founded in the twelfth century, and the name suggests that at a still earlier period the site was occupied by an anchorite or anchoress.

About the year 1160 Gilbert de Montfitchet, Lord of Wraybury, following the example of his father, the founder of Stratford Langthorn Abbey, Essex, founded the priory of Ankerwyke, endowing it with all the land known by that name, together with 'the assart which Richard de Bruera held, five acres of land in Wyresdebyri, and all the land of Alerburn.'²

¹ The subject as a whole has been ably dealt with by Miss Eileen Power in 'Mediaeval English Nunneries,' and I have to thank her, not only for permission to quote freely from her book, but also for help on various points connected with this article.

² Alderburn near Uxbridge.

Later, in conjunction with his wife, Avelina, he also gave 'all the meadow in the same vill called Wymede.' Gilbert also secured the goodwill and active co-operation of the abbot and convent of Chertsey, whose domain lay upon the opposite side of the Thames, for abbot Hugh (circa. 1150) gave half a hide and five acres of land in 'Purnershe.' This land, later known as Ankerwyke Purnish, was situated on the slope of the hill overlooking Runnymede. In addition the abbot permitted several of his Egham tenants to make grants of land to the newly-founded priory. Grunwin de Trotsworth gave an acre in Egham, and Geoffrey de Middleton 'all the land which Aylmer held there.' Henry, son of Henry de Middleton, gave a croft in Egham called Tutescroft; Ralph Picke, an acre in the same parish; and Ralph, the son of Matthew, ten acres of grove in Herpsfeud. Trotsworth and Middleton, or Milton, were subordinate or reputed manors in Egham, held of Chertsey. Herpsfeud, later Harpsford, was a hamlet with a mill, now covered by Virginia Water.

The date of Gilbert's death is unknown; he was succeeded by his son Richard, who gave the priory 'land called Moreland,' the meadow one Goscelin held in Wraybury, and an island in the Thames called 'Tyngeyt.' The latter, no longer an island, except in flood-time, is known as Tinsey Mead, and though upon the Surrey side of the river is still part of Bucks, a fact which indicates that at some remote period, but posterior to the formation of counties, the river has altered its course. When Richard died in 1203 he was succeeded by his ten year old son, who also bore the name of Richard. His wardship was granted to Roger de Lacey, but later the boy's mother purchased it of the king. The fact that this Richard was also a benefactor to Ankerwyke appears to have been overlooked. He gave half a virgate of land and a weir in the Thames, held by Thomas le Newe.

It must have been with much anxiety and trepidation that the nuns of Ankerwyke watched the assembling of the rival armies on Runnymede in June, 1215; but young Richard, their patron, was in the baronial camp, and doubtless saw to it that the good ladies of Ankerwyke were protected from insult or injury, also from too insistent demands for draughts of convent ale. Though Richard must have been one of the youngest of

the barons—he was but twenty—he was chosen one of the twenty-five appointed to supervise the carrying out of the articles of Magna Carta. He out-lived all his co-adjutors. During Richard's lifetime the priory received two marks of royal favour. In 1242 the king gave the nuns licence to turn out annually, free of pannage, sixty pigs in Windsor Forest.³ In 1251 he gave them the tithes of his mill in Windsor Park.⁴

In 1242 the king had given a sum of £8 6s. 8d. to be divided between two thousand poor persons, one half to be distributed at Broomhall, the other at Ankerwyke, for the welfare of the soul of his sister Isabella, wife of Frederic II, Emperor of Germany.⁵ Richard survived until 1268, but some twelve years before his death it was thought advisable to obtain a royal confirmation of the various gifts and grants which had been made to the priory, and it is from this record that we get the list of benefactions already quoted.⁶ In addition to these the charter furnishes a number of gifts and grants of houses, land and reats in London, Windsor, Horton, Greenford, Henley, and Manuden and Takeley in Essex; but as the list is printed in Dugdale there is no necessity to give it in detail.

The Takeley benefaction was a gift of rent amounting to 30s. by Albretha de Basingburn, which the priory retained until its dissolution; but there is no mention of three virgates of land which the priory had acquired there as early as 1194. The charter recording this transaction is of interest for several reasons, for it not only gives the name of the first prioress of whom we have any knowledge but is also one of the very few muniments of the house which has survived. Incidentally it shows that the Norman still held a distinctive position in England at the end of the twelfth century.

'To all the faithful of Holy Church, as well French as English, Lecia, Prioress of Ankerwyke and the convent of the same place sendeth greeting. Know ye all that we have made a final agreement with William, son of Elias de Takeley, upon the following terms in the Court of our Lord the King, to wit, the aforesaid William has granted to us three virgates of land with the appurtenances in Takeley, to hold

³ Charter Roll. 26 Hen. III.

⁴ Pat. Roll. 35 Hen. III.

⁵ Devon, *Issues of the Exchequer*, p. 19.

⁶ Charter Roll. 41 Hen. III. m. 3.

from the aforesaid William and his heirs freely and quietly by the service set forth in the cheirograph made in the Court of our Lord the King on the Saturday next after the Feast of St. Lawrence the Martyr in the fifth year of the reign of King Richard, and be it known also that if the heirs of Richard le Engleis (wrest) or deraign the aforesaid three virgates of land in Takeley from us the aforesaid nuns, we shall have another exchange from the aforesaid William or his heirs. Witnesses: Avenel the Butler, Master William de Somercote, Master Reiner de Stanford, Master Gervase de Hobregge, Robert and Alencun de Stace of Kersinge, Andrew de Poilli and many others.' ⁷

A fine impression of the convent seal is attached to this charter.

Probably the land had been lost to the priory before 1256, as was a gift by the first witness to the charter, Avenel the Butler, who had promised the nuns the first presentation to the living of Dunchurch, Warwick, and had given them a bond for a payment of 20s. annually until a vacancy occurred. Unfortunately the presentation was the property of Avenel's wife, and she raised difficulties, whereupon the nuns sued Avenel in the King's Court. After several adjournments the Court shelved the matter by ordering that the case should stand over until Jordan, the son of Avenel, whose inheritance the patronage was declared to be, should be of age to plead his own cause; in the meantime Avenel was to pay the annuity in accordance with his bond, which the nuns produced.⁸ We hear no more of the matter. Richard le Engleis, mentioned in the Takeley charter, was also a benefactor, for we find his name in the confirmation of 1256 as the donor of rent amounting to 15s. at Manuden, Essex.

In 1265 Peter, 'called Clanag,' or, as another record has it, 'Clausag,' baker, gave a sum of 8s. rent out of a house in Aldersgate Street, London, which he held of the Canons of St. Bartholomew.⁹ Three years later Peter gave the house to Robert de Aldenham, buckler maker, who exchanged it with Adam de Stratone, clerk, for land at Shenley, Herts,¹⁰ the rent

⁷ Campb. Ch. X, 7 (B.M.).

⁸ Cal. Curia Regis. 2. John.

⁹ Cal. Ancient Deeds. Vol. 2, A. 1983.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* Vol. I.A. 1515.

to Ankerwyke being reserved. Adam de Stratone was a very acquisitive cleric, whose dealings in landed property appear frequently in the Calendar of Ancient Deeds. In 1269-70 he induced the nuns of Ankerwyke to grant him rents out of their London property amounting to 28s. 10d., for a sum of £12, or little over eight years' purchase. The property was in Distaff Lane, Fish Street, and Aldersgate.¹¹ The grant was in perpetuity, with a quit rent of 1d. a year, and seeing that even then the property was rapidly rising in value, the bargain was a very foolish one on the part of the priory, an example of the way in which Ankerwyke and many another religious house brought themselves to poverty. In 1266 or 7—the entry is not closely dated—we have the enrolment of a grant by Ralph Jocelin to the priory, of 12s. rent from land in Stanwell, 'for the health of my soul and the soul of my wife Agnes.'¹²

Geoffrey de Pycheford, Steward to Queen Eleanor and Constable of Windsor Castle from 1273 until his death in 1299, was not exactly the type of man one would expect to be interested in a religious house; but he appears to have been on friendly terms with the community at Ankerwyke, and possibly was a benefactor of the house. In 1280 he was married at the priory church, and at the door, in the presence of Margery, the prioress and other witnesses, he dowered his bride, Alice, 'with all the lands of Rumbaldswick and of Drayton, to wit a fourth part of the town and other lands.'¹³ No doubt Geoffrey made a suitable oblation, and as we find the priory at a later period holding land in Drayton, it is quite likely that he or his wife were the donors. In the next year Geoffrey presided at an inquisition held at Purnershe, when the nuns received licence to enclose a hundred acres of waste in Windsor Forest, part of the fee of Chertsey Monastery.¹⁴ The privilege could not have been a very valuable one, for in order to protect the royal hunting rights, the land could only be enclosed with a low hedge and a shallow ditch to give free passage for the deer at all times.

In 1285 the nuns received permission to take possession of 44y acres of land in Stanwell, given them by William Passe-

¹¹ Cal. Ancient Deeds. Vol. I.A. 1590.

¹² Close Roll. 51 Hen. III.

¹³ Close Roll. 8 Ed. I.

¹⁴ Pat. Roll. 10 Ed. I.

vand, 'notwithstanding the Statute of Mortmain.'¹⁵ According to the Taxation of Pope Nicholas in 1291, Ankerwyke was in receipt of 10s. yearly from Egham Church, but how they acquired it is not clear. Towards the end of the thirteenth century the manor of Wraysbury was in the hands of Christian de Mauriscis, who shortly before her death gave the priory a teneement and a virgate of land there.¹⁶ In 1362-3 Thomas Tyle, in making a grant of a house in Old Windsor, reserved a rent of sixpence to Ankerwyke.¹⁷ In 1366 licence was granted to Roger Belet to grant rents in Staines, amounting to 48s. 10d. a year, to the priory.¹⁸ With this benefaction the list of Ankerwyke acquisitions appears to have come to an end.

It is very difficult to arrive at even an approximate estimate of the revenue of the house at this period. The details concerning the earlier benefactions are often very meagre. No acreage is given for the land and no rental value for the houses. The money rents specified amount to £12, and the total acreage mentioned amounts to about 480, which, at a shilling per acre, would yield £24, making a total of £36, equal to about £700 of present value.¹⁹ In this calculation the demesne lands of Ankerwyke have not been included.

Compared with such houses as Syon or Shaftesbury, Ankerwyke was certainly a poor house, but, properly husbanded, its income should have sufficed to support the six or seven nuns which was its normal number. For it must not be overlooked that the revenue from endowments was not the sole income of a religious house. In the case of Ankerwyke, the demesne lands, properly cultivated, should have produced the major part of the food for the nuns and dependents. Sheep were kept, and the average sales of wool was four sacks yearly,²⁰ and this should have gone a good way towards the cost of clothing. There was also the profit on the pigs turned out in the Forest, the profits of the weir and the tithes of the mill. The nuns, although they had woodland of their own, received royal grants of timber

¹⁵ Close Roll. 14 Ed. I.

¹⁶ Inq. P.M. 29 Ed. I.

¹⁷ Cal. Anc. Deeds. Vol. I. A. 172.

¹⁸ Pat. Roll. 40 Ed. III.

¹⁹ In 1316 land in Egham was valued at 10d. per acre, but rose greatly after the middle of the century.

²⁰ 'Growth of English Industry,' Cunningham. I. App. D. pp. 628-41. (Ed. 1905.).

from the Forest for repairs.²¹ As in other nunneries, scholars and boarders were taken, though the latter often proved unprofitable bargains, corrodies being granted for inadequate consideration.

Although the Rule forbade nuns to hold private property, we find in many mediaeval wills bequests to nuns of jewels, rents, money and clothing, much of which eventually became the property of the house. Lastly we have the sum which had to be paid when a woman entered a religious house. According to the Rule this was limited to such sum as the relatives or friends chose to give, but in practice it became in many cases a matter of bargaining, and in others a fixed tariff was in force. In some houses as little as £5 was taken; in others it amounted to as much as £50; and relatives often made provision for this charge in their wills.

Postulants had also to bring with them an outfit of clothing, bed and bedding.

The hospitality dispensed by religious houses was not all outgoing, for visitors of rank usually left some acknowledgement, whilst weddings and christenings, though forbidden by the Rule, doubtless brought in somewhat in the form of oblations. In the face of the Statute of Mortmain, which, by the way, was evaded systematically, people often gave money in their lifetime for a special purpose—the paying off of a debt or for repairs to the conventual church or buildings. Of course there is the other side of the account, the quit rents and services by which the properties were held. Regal and Papal dues and exactions. Losses by flood,²² fire and disease. The charge of a chaplain, cost of repairs and litigation—the latter was often a heavy item. But when all deductions have been allowed for, the net income should have sufficed to keep a small house like Ankerwyke free from debt at least. There is, however, little doubt that the poverty of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries was brought about by bad administration. Indeed it would have been surprising to find it otherwise, for the nuns were drawn from the families of the landed gentry and rich mer-

²¹ 'Royal Forests of England,' J. C. Cox, p. 288.

²² Ankerwyke was particularly liable to floods, and this must have been increased by the making of the causeway between Egham and Staines in the reign of Hen. III as the bank kept the water from the Surrey side and forced it over the low-lying land of Wraysbury and Ankerwyke.

chants, they had little or no knowledge of business and fell an easy prey to astute men of affairs like Adam de Stratone. We have no financial statements of the house earlier than the sixteenth century, but these clearly show that a great portion of the original endowments had disappeared.

We can now turn to the interior history of the house, and, thanks to the Bishop's Registers, together with some stray references in wills and other records, we can obtain a clearer idea of the doings of the little community than might have been expected. As the writer in the V.C.H. remarks, what little we do know is not greatly to its credit; but it should not be forgotten that it is the seamy side which fills the major part of most historical records, particularly those of religious houses. Unlike the sundial, their annals do not record the days of sunshine, the periods of efficient rule, the times when the sisters dwelt together in peace and charity, striving to fulfil the purpose for which the house was founded. As it is, for the most part we have sad and sordid stories of quarrels and litigation, petty oppression, bitter complaints, wrongdoing, extravagance and waste, which seem to justify the final suppression, but not the confiscation which accompanied it.

Ankerwyke seems to have begun badly, for, as we have seen, Lecia, the first recorded prioress, was involved in what must have been costly litigation. This, however, was not her first appearance in the Curia Regis. One of her sisters, who had been professed for fifteen years and held the office of precentrix, absconded. We have only the dry bones of the story and no record of the final result. We have not even her name in full; she is mentioned as A, the daughter of W. Clement. Her contention was that she had been forced into the nunnery by a guardian who wished to retain her share of her father's property. The first use she made of her freedom was to claim her inheritance, a proceeding which roused the active opposition of her relatives, who were apparently people of position and influence. The runaway, aided and abetted by a certain W. de Bidun, proved contumacious, and the matter was carried to Rome. Pope Celestine III sent a mandate to the Abbot of Reading and the Prior of Hurley, directing them to see that the apostate returned. As this proved unavailing, and the resources of the ecclesiastical law were at an end, the pair were

excommunicated and proceedings begun in the civil court. Unfortunately we have no record of the result.²³

The date of Lecia's resignation or death is unknown, and the name of the next prioress, Emma, does not occur before 1236. There is no entry respecting Ankerwyke in the Register of Hugh de Welles (1188-1200), so it would seem that Emma was elected in the time of his successor, William de Blois, or in the three years' vacancy which preceded and followed his episcopate. Emma died in 1238, whereupon the nuns elected one of their number, Christina de Lond' (? London). Bishop Grosseteste promptly quashed the election, and appointed Celestrina, a nun of Marlow. The election of Christina was said to be contrary to the form of the Lateran council, and it looks as if the nuns had merely obtained permission to elect from the patron, Richard de Muntfitchet, and ignored the bishop and the king.²⁴ It looks also as if the appointment of an outsider was meant as a punishment to the nuns for the irregularity, but it may have been that they had got wind of the probability of an unwelcome intrusion and hurriedly made their own choice. There appears to have been a good deal of intriguing and wire pulling to secure these positions; on the other hand, the bishop may have had good reasons for thinking that none of the community were fitted for the post. In 1241, during the reign of Celestrina, an arrangement was made with the priory of Bermondsey respecting the tithes of Greenford, whereby Ankerwyke was to receive 5s. annually.²⁵

In 1244 the post of prioress was again vacant, whether by resignation or death is not known, and Julian, a nun of the house, was elected.²⁶ Her reign also was a brief one, for in 1250 Joan of Rouen, also a member of the community, was chosen to take her place.²⁷ To the entry recording her election is added the following note: 'Inasmuch as all things should be done quickly she was appointed accordingly.' The name of the next recorded prioress, Margery of Hedsor, does not occur before 1270, when she made the grant of London property to Adam de Stratone. Margery it was who witnessed the marriage

²³ Curia Regis Roll. 48. m. 14.

²⁴ Bishop's Registers, Lincoln (Cant. and York Soc.), Grosseteste, pp. 345-6.

²⁵ Manning and Bray, 'Surrey,' Vol. I. p. 196.

²⁶ Bp's Reg. as above, p. 369.

²⁷ *Ibid.* p. 381.

of Geoffrey de Picheford in 1280. As Steward to Queen Eleanor Geoffrey had some official dealings with Adam, and may have been the intermediary in the London grant.²⁸ Geoffrey was also a witness to a charter, an undated copy of which is in the Chertsey Cartulary, whereby Margery exchanged certain lands in Purnershe for a croft by the highway between Staines and Windsor, with Bartholomew, abbot of Chertsey (1272-1307). This charter can safely be placed before 1299, for in that year Geoffrey died. A Nicholas de Heddeshore is also a witness; he was probably a relative of the prioress.²⁹

Another undated charter in the same Cartulary records a grant by Margery to William de Eton, rector of Datchet, of a house and land in Egham, which the priory held of Chertsey. The rent was to be 2s. 6d., and William paid 40s. for the grant.³⁰ The next Ankerwyke charter is to be found in the same source, and presents one of those little enigmas, so puzzling to the antiquary, which after much vain labour have to be left unsolved. In the Chertsey Cartulary is an undated grant by John, the abbot to Katherine, prioress of Ankerwyke. The abbot was John de Rutherwyke (1307-1346), but of Katherine we have no other mention. A glance at the list of prioresses will show that if there was a prioress of that name she must come between Alice de Sandford, elected in 1305, and Emma de Kimberley, elected in 1316; but it is much more likely that the name is a copyist's error. The Cartulary was compiled in the reign of Hen. VI nearly a century and a half after the transaction in question, and has numerous verbal errors and omissions. So numerous are the mistakes that it would be unwise to add the name of Katherine to the list of prioresses on the unsupported evidence of the Cartulary. The charter itself records an exchange of lands in Purnershe.³¹

Now Rutherwyke was very fond of these schoolboy methods of acquisition, and on the face of them these little transactions appear to be quite reasonable and equitable bargains. But Rutherwyke, by far the greatest of the long line of Chertsey abbots, was an extremely astute man of business, and it is not surprising to find that these little 'deals' were part of one of

²⁸ Cal. Anc. Deeds. Vol. I, A. 87.

²⁹ Chertsey Cart. (Ex. K.R. Misc. Bks. Vol. 25. f. 230d.)

³⁰ *Ibid.* f. 226d.

³¹ *Ibid.* f. 230d.

his schemes for evading the Statute of Mortmain. The full story is too long to be given in detail, and is also somewhat outside our present purpose, but is worth following in brief, as it not only shows how easily the statute was evaded but also how helpless the inexperienced prioress of a nunnery was in the hands of a masterful and crafty man of affairs.

The procedure appears to have been this : Rutherwyke procured a dummy benefactor in the person of Walter de Clerkenwell, chaplain, who, by the way, held one of the livings appropriated to the monastery. Walter said he wished to have his anniversary celebrated by the monks of Chertsey after his death, and proceeded to buy up land for the endowment ; all the tempting little bits that lay on the outskirts of the Abbey's domain. He then handed over the whole to the Abbot, and received a formal lease of them for his life. During that time he would be paying the monastery a quit rent, and at his death the whole would revert to the community. Rutherwyke next proceeded to shuffle the cards, by making various grants and exchanges, and finally made an arrangement with Emma de Kimberley, prioress of Ankerwyke, whereby certain lands were confirmed to the priory at a quit rent of 26s. 8d., and the prioress gave a quit claim to others which the abbot had recently acquired.³²

There is little doubt that the whole performance was a pious fraud, that the lands were purchased by direction of the abbot, and with funds of his providing. By passing over some of the new acquisitions to Ankerwyke he made that community a party to any litigation or trouble that might ensue, whilst Chertsey was covered by the prioress's quit claim. His astuteness is shown by the fact that the little scheme very nearly went awry, for Rutherwyke was actually dispossessed of some of the property acquired by Walter de Clerkenwell ; but in this case he had also secured quit claims, and recovered the property on the strength of them. Apparently this method of evading the statute was too full of risks to be followed a second time, so when Rutherwyke was again desirous of purchasing more property than the statute allowed he went to work in a somewhat different way. It is, however, but fair to Rutherwyke to say that the acquisitions were made under a royal licence to purchase land and rents to the amount of £50 a year.

³² *Ibid.* f. 230.

Resuming the thread of our little history, we must go back to Alice de Sandford, who followed Margery of Hedsor in 1305. It is probable that, as has been suggested, she was a member of the family which held the advowson of Missenden some years earlier. Alice made an unfortunate investment for the house by the acquisition of land in Datchet. According to a petition presented to Parliament by her successor, Hugh le Despencer, the elder, who held the manor, had ousted the nuns from some fifty acres of land there. The nuns prayed to be re-instated and claimed damages to the amount of £100.³³ The answer was a query as to the name of the present owner of the land, and there the matter seems to have ended. Whether Alice resigned or died we do not know, but in 1316 Emma le Kimberley was elected and held the office until her death in 1327, when Joan of Oxford took her place. After a reign of twenty-two years she died, probably of the Black Death. At this point there is a gap of thirty-five years in the list of prioresses, Joan Godman, elected in 1384, being the next who appears in the published lists. There was certainly one, if not more, prioresses in the interval, and it is not at all strange that in the chaos which followed the pestilence their names have been lost; but it is certainly curious that the name of one of them has been overlooked, seeing that it is mentioned in a very accessible published source.

In the Calendar of Wills of the Court of Husting, London, we find the will of William de Bathe, of the parish of St. Bridget. It is dated 10 July, 1375, and after providing for his wife, Christina, he gave practically the whole of his property to pious uses. To his daughter, Matilda, a nun of Ankerwyke—he mentions no other children—he left a silver cup weighing sixteen shillings. To Alice, prioress of Ankerwyke, he left a tenement in Shoe Lane on condition that the nuns maintained a chantry for the good of his soul, the souls of his wife Christina and others, and kept the tenement in good repair. To Matilda certain rents of a tenement near the Flete, with remainder to the nuns of Ankerwyke for clothing, etc.³⁴ A grave scandal arose at Ankerwyke during the reign of Alice, although she is

³³ Rolls of Parlt. ii, 406.

³⁴ Cal. Wills of Court of Husting, London, Vol. II, pp. 182-3. See also Vol. I, p. 638. Henry de Causton left a bequest to Johanna, a 'sister' at Ankerwyke, formerly servant to his father (1348). She was probably only a lay sister.

not mentioned by name in the record. One of the nuns, aided and abetted by certain lay folk, ran away by night and carried off goods belonging to the house. Bishop Bockyngham excommunicated the runaway and her confederates.³⁵ Joan Godman died in 1390, and it is not surprising to find that Matilda de Bathe was elected to the post. She appears in most lists as Maude Booth. Maud and Matilda are synonymous, but Booth is an error.

The fact that Ankerwyke was subject to losses by flood has already been mentioned. In 1395 Bishop Fordham of Ely, no doubt acting for Bockyngham, granted the nuns an indulgence on that account.³⁶ Matilda resigned in 1401, when Elizabeth Golafre was elected. She was of a well-known Berkshire family, the Golafres of Fyfield. Accurate information as to their pedigree seems hard to come by, but there is little doubt that she was one of the illegitimate issue of Sir John, who died in 1379, and if so she was sister to Alice, prioress of Burnham in 1403. Elizabeth appears to have resigned early in 1421, when Clemence Medford, a nun of Broomhall, was put in by Bishop Flemyng. The reason for the importation of a stranger is not given; possibly the bishop did not consider either of the Ankerwyke nuns fit for the post. On the other hand, Clemence Medford had relatives who held high office in the church—Walter Medford, Dean of Wells, Richard Medford, Bishop of Salisbury—and it is not at all unlikely that influence was brought to bear in the appointment.³⁷ Be that as it may, Clemence proved an utter failure as a prioress. From the Bishop's Registers we learn much more about Clemence and the state of the house under her rule than we know of any of her predecessors and successors.

For twenty years Clemence seems to have done as she liked, and from a community point of view was guilty of every sin save immorality. At length, in 1441, Alnwick, Bishop of Lincoln, visited the house, and if we liberally discount the stories told him by that section of the nuns who were the bitter enemies

³⁵ Linc. Epis. Reg. Bockyngham, Memo. 247.

³⁶ Ely Epis. Records (Gibbons), p. 399.

³⁷ In an account of Broomhall in Vol. 27 of this Journal the date of the election of Clemence is wrongly given as 1440, and there is a mis-reading of a simple document which was merely a licence from her superior at Broomhall to take up her new post; but the inference drawn from the mis-reading is probably correct.

of the prioress, the house was in a deplorable condition. At the opening of the proceedings, instead of handing the bishop a certificate of his mandate, she offered the original document. She excused herself by admitting that she could not read the document, and had no lettered person to assist her, by which we conclude that her chaplain was no scholar and that Clemence had not been visited by the bishop before. After some further preliminaries Clemence produced some of the archives of the house and a rent roll, by which it appeared that the net income of the house was £22 6s. 7d. ; but 'touching the stewardship of the temporalities and the receipts from alms and other sources she showed nothing.' Clemence claimed that she had reduced the debts of the house from 300 marks to £40, a statement that was flatly contradicted by one of her sisters. She then proceeded to complain of the behaviour of the nuns, saying that they were 'moved against her on slight occasions; also that they drank almost of custom every day, contrary to the rule,' and further that they drank after compline when they should have been in bed. Dame Isabel Standene, the sub-prioress, alone was loyal to her chief, and said that all was well. The remainder of the nuns, led by Margery Kirkeby, the cellaress, told a very different tale.

In justice to poor Clemence it should be said that it was very apparent that Margery had an eye upon the prioress's place, and had, with her following, made up their minds to make it as warm as they could for their chief. Margery started off with complaints about the state of the conventual buildings, which she said were going to wrack and ruin by reason of the negligence of the prioress. She told also how the prioress had gone off to a wedding at Broomhall, and in her absence the sheepfold, the dairy and a barn had been consumed by fire. Clemence confessed to the wedding and also to the other charges. Margery complained that the prioress kept the common seal in her own hands, and used it as she liked, without the knowledge, consent or even the advice of the nuns. Clemence admitted that she had kept the seal for seasons, years and days; but she got in a shrewd thrust at Margery and her party by saying that she sometimes kept it in conjunction with her fellow nuns 'for so long as there have been any of discretion in that place.' Next came complaints about the vestments, Mar-

gery asserting that they 'were wont to be of great mark and many in number : where they be gone or whether they be there is not known.' The insinuation was that they had been sold or given away. However, Clemence was able to produce a schedule of the vestments and jewels that she took over, so they proceeded to the next complaint. There had been four chalices, now but one. Clemence confessed to four, but said there were still two in the house ; the third was in pawn to Thomas Stanes, the fourth had been broken up ; both had been dealt with by consent of the convent.

A silver censer and chalice, the heaviest they had, had been broken up and the metal handed to William Tudyngtone, a monk of Chertsey, to be made into a cup for use at the table. Clemence owned that she was unable to pay the monk what he had expended and the cup was still in his hands. She asserted that the matter was done with the knowledge and consent of the convent, but this the nuns denied. Margery said that there used to be ten beautiful psalters in the house, but some had been given away or alienated. Clemence owned that she had lent three, one to the prioress of Broomhall, with the consent of the convent. At Rowel,³⁸ in Purnershe, the prioress was said to have felled wood at an unseasonable time and left the boughs lying about, 'by reason whereof it is not likely that the wood will grow again to the profit of folk now living.' Clemence denied the accusation. She also denied that she had sold a hundred oaks at 'ly parkis' without compulsion or necessity, or that she had felled beeches at Alderbourne at such a time that the wood would not grow again. Margery then returned to her charges of withholding the accounts from the chapter and dispatching important business, such as the making of leases, without the advice or consent of the nuns. Margery emphatically denied that the house was three hundred marks in debt when Clemence came, saying 'outright' that the debt was but thirty pounds, and this had been paid without any call upon the resources of the priory or the prioress. The first part of the accusation Clemence admitted, except the making of leases ; she appears to have given no answer to the matter of the debt.

Margery complained that a gatehouse had been blocked up,³⁹

³⁸ Probably meant for 'Rowyk.'

³⁹ Of the ruins of the priory but few vestiges remain. Our president is of opinion that the existing masonry formed part of the gatehouse.

through which the needful stuff was brought in, and pease pods and other draff carried out,' and now all things were carried through the church, to the great scandal of the house. Clemence admitted the charge, but said it was done to keep the pigs and other beasts out of the cloister, 'which formerly did befoul it.' Six nuns had left the house, and the prioress was to blame for their apostasy. The prioress confessed that the nuns had left, but without her knowledge. Margery's next complaint was that the prioress had appropriated the places of four nuns in the dorter and had blocked up the view Thamesward, 'which was a great diversion to the nuns.' Clemence confessed the appropriation. The other charge was a blunder on the part of Margery, for it gave the prioress a chance for a crushing retort. She owned that she had blocked the view 'because men stood in the narrow space and talked with the nuns.'

This reply seems to have stung the voluble Margery, and she proceeded to more personal matters. She said the prioress wore golden rings 'exceedingly costly and divers precious stones, silken veils and girdles silvered and gilded.' That she wore her veils so high that her forehead could be seen of all; also she wore furs of vair. To all these vanities Clemence sorrowfully confessed, and promised to do so no more. She denied that she wore shifts of cloth of Reynes at sixteen shillings a yard, but admitted that she had worn kirtles laced with silk and tiring pins of silver and silver gilt; but to the charge that she had made the nuns do the like she said nothing. For her own part she promised amendment and would do penance. Though Clemence defended herself for wearing a 'cap of estate' furred with budge above her veil by saying that she wore it on account of divers infirmities in her head, yet she promised to reform this also. For three years past, according to Margery, the prioress had not furnished the nuns with fitting habits, 'inasmuch as they go about in patched clothes.' Clemence made no reply to this charge, for 'the threadbareness of the nuns was apparent to my lord.' Finally Margery asserted that when the prioress knew the bishop was coming she gave a great entertainment to her friends and neighbours, 'saying to them: "Stand on my side in this time of visutation, for I do not want to resign."' She confessed to the entertainment, 'but it was not to this end.'

The poor bishop's head must have ached by this time, but

he stuck manfully to his task, and called Dame Juliane Messengere. Her complaints followed much upon the lines of those of Margery, the state of the conventual buildings and the spoiling of the woods. But she went further and said that the prioress had received money to be spent upon repairs but had kept it for herself. Clemence admitted that the hay had been stored in the church for want of barns, but was able to show that she had done some repairs. Dame Juliane broke new ground when she charged the prioress with bringing into the house 'divers strangers and unknown folk, male and female, and maintains them at the common cost of the house.' Also that she made nuns of some that were incapable and almost witless. The latter Clemence denied; about the former the bishop had somewhat to say in his Injunctions. The remainder of Dame Juliane's complaints the prioress apparently could not deny, and the bishop directed they should be remedied. The nuns were said to be harshly treated by the prioress, 'even when their friends came to visit them.' The younger nuns had no governess to instruct them in reading and song. This was remedied by the appointment of Juliane to that office. The prioress seldom came to matins or mass, and when she did she spoke chidingly to the nuns. There were no serving folk in brewhouse, bakehouse or kitchen from the Nativity of St. John to Michaelmas following, and Juliane, with other sisters, had not only to bake and brew but also serve the table.

Sister Thomasine Talbot had apparently complained before. She said she was not provided with bedclothes and had to lie in the straw, 'and when my lord had commanded her to lie in the dorter, and this deponent asked bedclothes of the prioress, she said chidingly to her: "Let him who gave you leave to lie in the dorter supply you with raiment."' When the nun's friends came to see them the prioress was very cross when asked for leave to talk to them. Poor Thomasine said she had no kirtle; but the prioress wore a long silken band, in English a lace, which hangs down to her breast, and thereon a golden ring with one diamond, 'and she had all the archives and the seal of the house in her keeping.' Clemence confessed to the lace and ring, but said she only wore them in jest. Thomasine also said that the prioress came into the quire at the end of the canonical hours, and made the nuns begin all over again.

Sister Agnes Dychere wanted more to eat and more clothing for her bed and body to keep her warm, that she might have strength to undergo the burden of religious observances and divine service. She complained that she had to sing more psalms 'than is the manner accustomed to the place.' Sister Margaret Smythe was evidently one of the young nuns whose education was being so scandalously neglected; she asked for a governess 'in reading, song and religious observance.' She too was short of bedclothes, and said the prioress was too harsh and excessive in her corrections. The bishop, having heard more than enough, did not examine three young nuns, Isabel Coke, Elizabeth Londone and Ellen Moreton, 'on account of their age and slender discretion, seeing that the eldest of them is not more than thirteen years of age,' and adjourned his visitation.⁴⁰

A few weeks later he came again, and went all over the complaints in detail, dealing with some of the irregularities. It appeared that in the course of her quarrels with the prioress, Margery had called the latter a thief. Either there were no witnesses present or the nuns declined to give Margery away, so Margery 'cleared herself on her own witness alone.' The bishop then directed that a box should be made with two locks, and the archives of the house and the seal deposited therein. One key to be kept by the prioress, the other by one of the nuns, who was to be elected by themselves. It must have been gall and wormwood to Clemence when Margery was selected. The bishop was a cautious man, for until the box was made he put the seal into a little box and sealed it with his own seal.

There was another matter which is not mentioned in the list of complaints. Apparently Ankerwyke had dealings with the priory of Hinchinbrooke, for the bishop forbade the prioress of Ankerwyke to admit 'that nun of Hinchinbrooke either into the house or to dwell among them, and also that she should not deliver to her that bond which she has from the house of Hinchinbrooke or any other goods she has of the same house, but only to the reverend father himself.' Clemence was further admonished not to correct the sisters in the hearing of lay folk, only in chapter, and then 'in motherly, sisterly and temperate wise, and nowadays severely as had been her wont.' She was also

⁴⁰ Bps. Reg. Alnwick. The Visitation commenced Oct. 10, 1441.

to supply the sisters with sufficient food and raiment, and they were to treat the prioress with due reverence and honour, obeying her in all lawful things. On Ap. 30, 1442, the bishop sent two deputies to enquire as to the observance of his injunctions, when the prioress and nuns said that they had complied in all things save the matter of clothing, and this was owing to the poverty of the house. The nuns, being examined singly, affirmed that the injunctions had been obeyed, but again asked for clothing or an allowance of ten shillings a year in lieu thereof.

Clemence said that the poverty of the house was in great measure due to the want of a steward, and asked for one to be appointed. The deputies said they would refer the two points to the bishop, and after a further adjournment the visitation was dissolved. The bishop certainly took a most merciful view of the case against the vain and worldly prioress. Probably he saw through Margery Kirkeby and was not inclined to gratify her spite and ambition; he may also have doubted her qualifications for the office. She had not long to wait, for Clemence died within a few weeks after the visitation was completed, and the nuns elected Margery forthwith.

Whether the house benefitted by the change we cannot tell, but one of the first acts of Margery was to raise money on the London property. On 5 June, 1443, William Tounland, citizen and mercer of London, received a grant of 100s. a year from lands and houses belonging to the priory in the parish of St. Bride, for twenty years.⁴¹ The consideration is not specified. Among the numerous bequests to religious houses in the will of Sir Wm. Estfield, dated Mar. 15, 1446-7, is a gift to Ankerwyke.⁴² Of Margery's death or resignation there seems to be no record, but her successor, Margaret Porte, was, I think, in office in 1466. In 1463 John Breknok received from Edward IV a grant of the manor of Wraysbury, and the advowson of the priory of Ankerwyke, on account of charges incurred under Hen. VI. For this grant he was to do fealty and present a pair of spurs.⁴³ It is evident that the advowson of the priory church of Ankerwyke was not in the hands of the convent but of the Crown.

⁴¹ Close Roll, 21 Hen. VI. m. 8d.

⁴² Cal. Wills Ct. of Husting. Vol. 2. p. 509.

⁴³ Pat. Roll, 3 Ed. IV.

If the story told by John Lese, of Egham, to 'the right reverend fader in god and gracious lord Bishop of Bath and Wells, Chancellor of England' was true, then John Lese was a very ill-used man and Margaret Porte was an arbitrary and unscrupulous woman. John said that Dame Margaret, prioress of Ankerwyke, had let him a house and land in Egham, from Michaelmas in the sixth year of the king that now is for nineteen years. 'Now, because one Richard Gode came to the prioress and offered more, she would have him put out, and because he kept still the covenant she laboured and got an attachment out of the Castle of Windsor in another shire, and had him arrested and laid in the same Castle, then a fayned action for trespass was brought against him before the Mayor of Windsor in another shire, against all right and to his utter undoing.' ⁴⁴ How John Lese fared we do not know, but no doubt Margaret had an equally plausible tale to tell the 'right reverend fader in god.' The petition is undated, but as the chancellor was Stillington (1467-1475) and as the prioress is called Margaret, and not Margery, I conclude that the date was 1466, the king that 'now is,' was Ed. IV, and the prioress Margaret Porte. We get one more glimpse of Margaret when, in 1475, she sued William Marham, of Takeley, for debt amounting to six pounds. William failed to appear and was consequently outlawed. However, he eventually surrendered and was pardoned.⁴⁵ Margaret died in 1478, and Eleanor Spendelowe was installed by the bishop, Rotherham, and a royal confirmation issued in November of that year. The reason for this procedure was that there were not enough nuns for a canonical election.⁴⁶

As we hear no more of Eleanor, and Alice Worcester, the next prioress in the list, is not mentioned before 1526, it is possible there may have been a prioress between these two. We know, in fact, nothing more of the house until 1519, when Bishop Atwater visited it. He found things in a bad way; there were but five nuns; another, Alice Hubbart, a nun of four years' standing, had absconded and married a relative of Richard Sutton, steward of Syon. From this visitation we get an interesting inventory of the house. I append a translation, but it

⁴⁴ Early Chancery Proc. Bdle. 38. No. 217.

⁴⁵ Pat. Roll, 13 Ed. IV.

⁴⁶ Pat. Roll, 18 Ed. IV.

is not at all clear whether the last statement as to the income is a correction or whether the two are to be added. Miss Power suggests that the nuns tried to accentuate their poverty or, as usual, got into a muddle, with the result that an amended statement was entered as the end of the inventory. There is little doubt that this is the correct reading of the document. We have two later returns, one made in 1534 and the other in 1536, and both give the gross income at about £45. In 1519 the agents of Wolsey were prowling round extorting money to purchase 'his grace's favour,' and the heads of houses naturally emphasised their poverty.

'The rents here amount to £33 10s. gross, but they themselves pay for free rents £5 10s. And so they have clear upwards of 40 marks to provide for repairs and to meet other charges.

Jewels in the church: they have there at least thirteen priest's vestments of silk, also one cope of silk and gold, one chalice of silver gilt, one pair of censers, one pyx of silver for the sacrament, two printed missals, one pair of large candlesticks before the high altar, one pair of small candlesticks on the high altar, two silver phials, one pax-bread of silver, a small silver bell.

Goods: They have two cows, two mares, three old oxen, one young ox, one cow—years old (?), three plough mares.

Household stuff: Six feather beds, ten pairs of sheets, four pillow slips, four pairs of blankets, two 'white testers.'

They have yearly rents besides the lands of their demesnes in their own occupation, £46 10d., and pay in free rents £5 11s. 9d.⁴⁷

That the above is a full and accurate inventory is very much open to doubt. No list is given of ploughs, harrows, carts, or other agricultural implements. Nothing is said of the fittings and furnishings of kitchen, brewhouse or dairy. As late as 1435 the licence for the pigs in the forest was confirmed to Clemence Medford, and even though these had been sold and not replaced there would have been a half dozen in the home farm to consume the 'draff.'⁴⁸ Probably, as the pigs were out of sight, they were not mentioned.

⁴⁷ Linc. Epis. Reg. Visit. Atwater, f. 42.

⁴⁸ Pat. Roll, 13 Hen. VI. m. 91.

It was the age of sheep farming on a large scale, and we know that in the past the priory sold wool, but no sheep are set down in the inventory. Poor as the house was, it is evident that the list of belongings was but a perfunctory and inaccurate document. Alice Worcester is said to have resigned in 1526, and was succeeded by Magdalen Downes, who was a novice at the time of Atwater's visitation in 1519; but the name of Alice Worcester appears as prioress in a return made for the Valor Ecclesiasticus of 1534. In this return the gross income is set down as £45 4s. 4d., and net £22 os. 2d. At this time Andrew, Lord Windsor, was steward, and his remuneration is given at £1 a year, so it is evident that Bp. Atwater complied with the request for the appointment of a steward. There was also a bailiff, Henry Carter, at a salary of £3 6s. 8d. per annum.

The next mention we have of Ankerwyke is its appearance in the list of houses with less than £200 a year which were set down for suppression.⁴⁹ This list was made in 1536, and by July of 1537 Ankerwyke was an institution of the past. We do not know the exact date of the event, nor any details concerning it, beyond the fact that Magdalen Downes was given a pension of £5 a year, and afterwards married. She was living in 1552 and still drawing her pension. Hard things have been said of Magdalen because she married, but the lot of a woman turned out into a hard and unsympathetic world to which she had long been a stranger was not an enviable one. The hand that had driven her forth might, on some frivolous pretext, stop her little pension. If she had friends or relatives, it is probable that none of them wanted to be saddled with an old maid with the equivalent of a pound a week. If she had none, her position was still harder. The hand that framed her vows did not anticipate the dissolution of monasteries.

This is no place for a disquisition on monasteries or monasticism, but Ankerwyke, in common with many other nunneries, failed to attract women with a real vocation for a religious life, and simply became a refuge for girls whose relatives wished to be rid of them, or who saw, or fancied they saw, a safe and easy way of evading the troubles of spinsterhood in mediaeval days. For the last two centuries of its existence at least it is hard to see that the house served any useful purpose. Lax in

⁴⁹ Letters and Papers, Hen. VIII, 1536.

discipline, throttled with hopeless poverty, it lingered on until it fell an easy prey to an unscrupulous king and his horde of greedy sycophants. No time was lost in disposing of the priory and its domains. On Nov. 10, 1537, a lease was granted for twenty-one years to John Norris, at a rental of £6 9s. 4d., of the house and site of the late priory of Ankerwyke and the lands thereto belonging. A meadow or portion called Ankerwyke: a field of arable called Hallfield, with rocks (sic) and bushes in it. Meadows called Longmede, Goremede, Deymede and Moremede. An arable field called Redyfield: the herbage of a grove called Rowyke, and the tithes of all the premises.⁵⁰

The lands in Egham were granted to Robert ap Rice, probably a relative of John, the monastic visitor. It is generally stated and accepted that the king gave Ankerwyke to Bisham on its re-foundation, but a careful reading of the various records will show that all that Henry gave was the reversion after the leases to Norris and ap Rice.⁵¹ Upon the second and final dissolution of Bisham the king granted the reversions to Andrew, Lord Windsor, together with Tynseyt, then in tenure of David Eyre, and Purnish in tenure of William Downes, possibly a kinsman of the last prioress.

The story of Henry VIII and Lord Windsor which tells in picturesque phrase of the forced exchange of Stanwell, rests, I believe, wholly upon tradition, but the exchange itself is an historical fact. In 1541 Lord Windsor executed a deed whereby not only Stanwell but much other property, including the reversions to Ankerwyke, were made over to Henry, who also received £2,000 in hard cash to supplement the bargain.⁵² When the leases expired in 1550, the whole was granted to Sir Thomas Smith, afterwards Secretary of State. The later history of Ankerwyke and its owners is given in Lipscomb, and in detail by Gyll in his History of Wraybury; but there are one or two little matters of interest which appear to have escaped notice.

The Act for the Dissolution of the Lesser Monasteries contained a clause for the protection of tenants holding unexpired monastic leases, but the following case shows the perils of their position. A certain Morgan Lloyd of Egham said he had a long

⁵⁰ Letters and Papers, Hen. VIII, 1537.

⁵¹ *Ibid.* 1539-40.

⁵² Harl. MSS. No. 1880.

lease of Tynseyte from the prioress of Ankerwyke, and in 1562 he granted an under lease to Richard Smith for six years at a rental of £7. Sir Thomas Smith ejected Richard, but afterwards reinstated him at the same rental. In the meantime Lloyd, scenting trouble, sold his lease to Derrick Anthony, a London goldsmith. Richard Smith soon found himself in an unenviable position. He had given Lloyd a bond for £40 as a security for the payment of his rent. Anthony sued him, not for the rent, but for the forfeiture of the amount of the bond. Lloyd himself was dead, but the executor of his widow sued Richard for arrears of rent.⁵³ The result is not upon record, but it is to be hoped that Sir Thomas Smith was powerful enough to protect his tenant and namesake.

In 1637 Ankerwyke was in possession of the Salter family, and according to a note by Walker, Garter King of Arms, the young Lord Stafford died there in that year. Walker remarks that 'he was the only heir of that princely family, and last of so many great and illustrious peers, whose death was exceedingly lamented, and with teares by the third and excellent Earl of Arundel and Surrey, Earl Marshal of England, under whose tuition he was.' Walker, Garter, is strangely silent about Roger Stafford, heir to the young peer, whose claim to the title was denied on account of his poverty. The Harcourts, to whom Ankerwyke came a few years later, at one time left the mansion and built a new house at Purnish, across the river. The widow of the John Harcourt who died in 1785 married Admiral Molyneux, afterwards Lord Shouldham, and lived at Ankerwyke Purnish for some years. The family afterwards returned to Ankerwyke and the Purnish residence was demolished. In Lord Windsor's grant to Hen. VIII Purnish is described as a manor, but there is no evidence that it was one except by repute. However, the Harcourts treated it as such, as the following document in possession of the writer shows:—

'Notice is hereby given that a General Court Baron and Customary Court will be holden for the Manor of Ankerwyke Purnish in the County of Surrey, on Wednesday, the 27th of July, at 12 o'clock at noon, at the Barley Mow Inn on Englefield Green in the said County, and that the Copy-

⁵³ Proc. Ct. of Requests, Eliz. 95/3.

hold Tenants of the said Manor, having business at the said Court, are required then and there to appear and do suit and service.

Dated the 15th July, 1836.

JOHN LAKE, Steward.

PRIORESSES OF ANKERWYKE.

Lecia, 1194, Campb. Ch. x. 7.

Emma, occurs 1236, ob. 1239, Dugdale, Mon. IV, p. 220.

Celestrina, elect. 1238, Linc. Epis. Reg. Grossteste.

Julian, elect. 1244. *Ibid.*

Joan of Rouen, elect. 1251. *Ibid.*

Margery of Hedsor, occurs 1270, res. 1305, Close Roll, 8 Ed. I.
Cal. Ancient Deeds Vol. I. A. 1590.

Alice de Sandford, elect. 1305, Linc. Epis. Reg. Inst. Dalderby.
178.

Emma de Kimberley, elect, 1316, ob. 1327. Linc. Epis. Reg.
Memo. Dalderby, 326.

Joan of Oxford, elect 1327, ob. 1349. *Ibid.* Inst. Burghersh,
332a.

Alice, occurs 1375. Cal. Wills of Court of Husting, Lond. Vol.
II, pp. 182-3.

Joan Godman, elect 1384, ob. 1390, Linc. Epis. Reg. Bockyng-
ham, 376a.

Maud de Bathe, elect 1390. *Ibid.* 400.

Elizabeth Golafre, elect 1401 (on resig. of Maud). *Ibid.* Beau-
fort, 180.

Clemence Medford, elect 1421 (on resig. of Elizabeth) ob. 1442,
Linc. Epis. Reg. Alnwick, Visitation.

Margery Kirkeby, elect. 1442, Dugdale, Mon. Vol. IV, p. 230.

Margaret Porte, occurs 1475, ob. 1478, Linc. Epis. Reg. Inst.
Rotherham, 101a.

Eleanor Spendelow, elect. 1478, Pat. Roll, 18 Ed. IV m. 10.

Alice Worcester, said to have resigned in 1526.

Magdalen Downes, last prioress, date of elect. unknown. Pen-
sioned; afterwards married; living in 1552.