

MASWORTH CHURCH

AND DEDUCTIONS FROM DISCOVERIES MADE THEREIN
DURING THE WORK OF REPAIR, 1881—1906.

[BY THE REV. F. W. RAGG, M.A., F.R.HIST.S.].

The church with its once fine interior and ceiling was described with enthusiasm, except for its neglected condition, by J. Hassell in his "Tour of the Grand Junction," 1819. From this book, and from recollections of aged parishioners in 1880, when I became Vicar, it was possible to conjecture what it must have been before the repairs of 1828. After that time, but before 1854, when the Chancel was taken down and an entirely new one built, the visit of architectural experts to the churches of Bucks took place. Their report is embodied in the Notes published by J. H. Parker in 1849. These give the impression of a "plain, principally Perpendicular Church" with very little of interest apparent. Evidently what had caused Hassell's enthusiasm was already gone. The impression in 1880 was that of a partially old church in 19th century new disguise. This was the effect of the work in 1854 and 1860, as well as that of 1828. Modern tiles paved the floor at one level throughout, to the step before the Altar, except where slabs, at the same level, lay covering the graves of the family of West, and some near them; and this pavement buried to a depth of five inches the bases of the pillars between Nave and Aisle. The South doorway, re-opened about 1860 after being closed time out of mind, had a new exterior of modern moulding, and new door. The doorway of the Tower had apparently been repaired on the old lines. The West window of the Tower had tracery which perhaps was a copy of the old. A new North Porch, already closed and used as a Vestry, had a fine inner doorway to the Nave, of Perpendicular times, mutilated for the building of this Porch, which partly also built it in. The Font was new and plain, of 1860 work and design. The pulpit was new, of deal, set up on a very plain stone base, replacing, I was told, an old oak pulpit carved and canopied. The seats were all new, mostly deal. A screen of iron uprights fixed into a modern oak partition was placed



MASWORTH

VIEW FROM N.W., BEFORE RESTORATION.

in the two arcade arches which separate the Chancel and the Chantry. New Altar rails, inconveniently high, stood on a step too narrow for anything but painful kneeling. Still, though almost everything was new, there were still left the arcade with its part-buried bases, the doorways in the N. wall of the rood-loft stair, old jambs and arches and mouldings in the windows of Nave and Aisle, some of them truly fine, a niche containing a quotation from Sternhold and Hopkins, with jambs evidently older than the arch which topped them; the interior jambs and arches of the doorways and the lofty Tower Arch with its responds whose outer ribs had never been carried round the arch. Of the Perpendicular ceiling, the original moulded purlins remained, but the tie beams and corbels had been replaced by new pine beams plainly chamfered, and brackets unadorned. This ceiling was carried across the upper part of the opening of the Tower Archway—and in fact the top outer rib of that arch was outside the roof. Hence leakage in storms of rain. A few relics of old beauty were two stones, one adorned with rosebud and leaf, the other with vine and oak leaves, exposed in the South porch, both of them 14th century work; a companion to the former of these was (and is) in the North outside wall of the junction of the Nave and Chancel. It was partly hidden by a spout and spout-head. The stone, carved with vine leaves, is mentioned by Hassell as on the Tower floor, "most ruthlessly knocked about." Rain came in also at the junction of the Nave and Chancel, which had no gabled end, and only match-boarding as a finish. The larger window of the Nave North wall, its arch, and the rubble wall above, were too far gone in parts for anything but setting in new stone. The battlements ended abruptly with the Nave and Aisle; the lead covering of the chantry roof, carried over eaves above a willow wall plate, curled up, and gave trouble in stiff south-east winds. The Tower had still its original plinth and string courses, and its battlement coated with plaster and cement.

Had the fabric been sound there would have been little incentive for any undertaking; for the parish,

in my state of health, was sufficient, and even more. But needs must, and I began. The East window of the Chancel had been erected, as I knew afterwards, with neglect of all rules of the mason's art, and its tracery was already broken through the shoulder. The South wall was leaning outwards, and the buttresses built for its support still more so. There was a bulge in this wall in the interior which needed attention. Inside the church was an offensive odour when doors and windows were not open, and an unsoundness in portions of the platforms which upheld the seats. The "roughcast" exterior coating of the church was ineffective and unsightly, and was always giving trouble and causing expense.

At first I did not realise all that was wrong, and I had everything in building to learn; and had it been possible to collect funds sufficient for repair by architect and builder this would have been done.

The chief fault in the past attempts to remedy the result of long neglect and the evil of non-resident incumbents (few had resided in 250 years) had been covering the sores and fancying that this made the fabric sound—errors, not vandalism, which was left for 1912.

This general description of the church in 1880 is necessary for the elucidation of the repairs.

The Parish did not claim the fabric of the Chantry, nor did the Impropriators. The ownership was lost amongst the heirs of the family of West. The East wall of this, which, as I found afterwards, must have been rebuilt some inches further westward than the original wall, was in good condition, except at the corner and near the roof. The window opening was of very usual width for a four-light window, but new tracery for three lights had been inserted. The South wall of the Chantry, stripped of its roughcast, showed above the plinth a wall which needed no more than pointing for effective mending. All below had to be entirely re-faced. Further west this whole wall and its buttresses (built against it without a single tie) were decaying alike. The only weatherings left of the buttresses were two-inch slabs of stone placed sloping, and kept from falling by nails covered in

the plaster. The effect of the gap between these heavy-looking buttresses and the wall was to enhance decay. The string course under the battlements throughout was simply an attachment of 19th century Roman cement; no remains of any original were left. The plinth of the aisle was only mortar or plaster; the battlements themselves were 19th century red bricks cemented over—except one solitary coping stone cemented in part in the N.E. corner of the Tower. The South buttresses had been built to keep the wall from falling when it was ominously leaning outwards, but when this took place could only be conjectured from discoveries made in the progress of repairs. I took the buttress of the North Nave wall, which was evidently built with that wall, as my guide in re-constructing, it being original. For the type of re-facing to last, I took the pattern of that Nave North wall, which is of blocks of stone and intervals of flint arranged in chess-board fashion. But for economy I had the blocks (Hartwell stone) broken into lumps corresponding in size with the flints—there were no funds to spend much on Hartwell—and I thus gained more surface covering. For the lost plinth I copied that in the North wall. The South wall thus faced had to be re-built to some 18 inches' depth. The battlement was shored up with timber while the work went on below. Setting the foundation of this new surface several inches out brought it perpendicularly under the battlement, but left the westernmost of the three windows recessed at its lower portion, since it leans with the old wall. The windows I renewed outside to the glass line, except the middle unfoliated window, parts of the mullions and tracery of which had been laid as building material under its arch, and above a square-headed and small three-light window of 17th century work. This, finding the opening and jambs and rear arch of it good, and clearly co-eval with the wall with which it exactly leaned, John Beeby, my good old mason, and I copied in Bath stone. Its style indicates, though the window itself shows no pretence to belong to, the disguised and forgotten age of that South wall. The heads of the small window taken out I left affixed as a memorial

to the interior of the East Chantry wall, north of the tomb of Edmond West.

The decayed buttresses below the plinth had only rubble and perished stones left. I therefore purchased Hartwell stones from the old Long Marston Church, then just pulled down, and re-worked them for these bases.

An irregular line of larger stones, both outside and in the interior, near the Sternhold and Hopkins niche, told of re-construction of some settlement or defect, which various trains of reasoning suggested must have happened at about the time when the buttresses were first built. Of these stones, those from the outside which for preservation were removed, and some from the buttresses also, are now inside the Tower, affixed to a part where a gallery had been removed and the wall loosely re-built; one of these is a portion of an Early English or Early Decorated Gable Cross, another the gable point on which it had stood, both broken, found inside the buttress next the porch. These afforded part of the accumulative evidence which settled the period of the building of these buttresses. The cross could have belonged only to the chancel which visitation reports tell was ruinous in 1491 and in 1520, and was after that re-built. The gable point and this cross are of Totternhoe stone, and would not remain long without perishing, exposed on the ground to damp and frost. Hence these buttresses must have been built soon after. The remains of a plinth found in one of the buttresses, which had a section like that of the Tower, but was less heavy, seems to point to the same conclusion. Other stones discovered there, were fragments of coffin tops with floriated crosses (stowed in the loft of the Tower), and a broken corbel of stiff-leaved foliage, placed in the South wall of the Chancel above the middle capital. Some of the fragments set thus in the place of the gallery in the Tower wall are of windows of earlier date than any existing, and one of them has a hole for shutter bar, but no glass groove. The West window of the Aisle showed traces of insertion in a pre-existing wall—but this and the smaller North window of the Nave needed little repair, and contain their original bars.

The Tower and its buttresses I underpinned, more especially on the North-West and North. In its stairway, dark and dangerous through worn and broken steps, I inserted two extra small lights, and then could repair the steps. The buttresses of the Tower, of Hartwell stone, only needed the joints making good, which I did with good mortar and flint chippings. Original weatherings had been replaced with bricks and sloping tiles covered with mortar-plastering. For these, through insufficient funds, I substituted castings of cement concrete. When pointing up the Tower on its East face we found plain traces of the attachment of the original Nave steep-pointed roof, but no remains of the usual projection to cover the joint.

The Nave North wall was in good condition up to the thin continuous line of stone, containing no flints in its course a little above the buttress. This line I intended to show the level where the decaying rubble which had to be all re-faced began. It would seem to be an indication of the height of the old Nave wall when the steep roof was still in existence—but only approximately that. The roof of the 19th century North porch I raised by screw jacks (as I had done to the Nave roof), and thinned its East wall to clear the inner Perpendicular doorway of it and repair its mutilation. A portion of the 1854 East window of the Chancel, re-moulded inside, forms its North window. The iron spout-heads, which kept the stack-pipes close to the walls, and caused decay thereby, I replaced in most instances with stone, arranged to keep the stack-pipes clear of the walls, and these heads I carved.

For the chantry I erected a parapet to end the trouble caused by the south-east gales. This was a new feature, and I kept it by style distinct.

In order not to disturb the ceiling of the Nave I screwed the Nave roof up by means of screw-jacks, by the invaluable help of Mr. Job Gregory, carpenter, of Long Marston—now gone to his rest—and built the Nave walls up to the new position 4ft. 1½ in., having a line of bricks along both sides of the interior; placed to show where this heightening began. By this eleva-

tion the Tower arch was brought altogether under the roof, its full height exposed, and, as I had intended, the leakage was stopped, and the way was also clear for the erection of a chancel arch and gable. Up to that time I had found no pieces of the original arch so long ago removed, but traces enough of its removal; and as the whole work of substitution was new I was left to my own devices for shape of arch and section of its stones and plan of capitals. To prevent blocking of the view at the end of a narrow Nave I set up corbels, not piers: these and their columns are portions of pillars and bases which were taken out of Tring Church, at that time under repair, adapted and re-cut. These corbels and caps I carved, designing as I went on. The suggestion of the capitals was first taken from the stone which I brought in from the South Porch to serve as the pedestal of the pulpit. I did not copy, but followed its general scheme. I was careful to do my carving only in new work where that had to be put in and represented nothing old which was in existence where it was placed. All simple repair was, I think, clearly discernible by intelligent eyes. The arch was worked and erected by the help of farm labourers, who finished the wall above it by my directions when I was too ill to leave my bed. The erection of this Chancel Arch led, without my intending it, to the erection of its corresponding arch in the South Aisle, when I discovered that the dry rot had reached the ends of the tie beams of that ceiling, and that there was a risk of insufficient support for the leaning pier against which the Chancel Arch rested, though I kept it under observation by means of an old opening in a joint, and saw no sign of its opening wider. A transverse section of masonry there I knew would give much additional strength. The Aisle is 18 inches wider than the Nave, but by means of successive corbels I narrowed the opening of this arch, and directed its thrust to the part best calculated to support the pier and the chancel arch, as well as on its South side, to the inside of the aisle wall.

The Tower Arch needed repair in its North limb, where the early settlement had crushed one of its

stones whose place was filled with mortar and rubble; these I replaced with stone. The tiles which paved the Nave and Aisle, but did not extend under the platforms of the seats, I took up, dissolving the joints with acid solution, but broke some. However, by relaying these on the level of the original floor, which was very easily discovered, in a pattern which caused Bishop Leslie Randal to remark "This is the proper use of tiles," and by the use of a few paving stones, I was able to do without the broken ones. The tiles in the chancel I left as they were.

Lowering the nave and aisle floor afforded relief to the bases of the arcade, which I caused to be repaired, and it revealed the cause of the dry rot and evil odour. The joists of the wooden platforms of the seats had been laid in earth, and without arrangement for ventilation. I had the earth cleared away and concreted the floor, and planned a new platform without joists arranged in such sections that it could easily be removed, if needful, and placed back again, and to this I fitted new seats of oak, shaped to give a chance for carving the ends, which never came. The work at the floor also revealed the existence of the top and base, both broken, of the stone altar, which lay under it. These, by advice of Bishop Randal, I buried under the present Altar, and thereby raised it up a step. Two early stone coffin tops, one a child's, found also there, thrown in upside down, I placed in the chantry near the tomb of Edmond West. The few mediæval tiles found in the process I fixed in the South side of the Chantry floor.

In the leaning pier which is now buttressed by my new arches I discovered the opening perhaps to connect two rood lofts, but bricked up. For this I had to devise new arches—none remained. This pier on the South side I underpinned, finding its foundation stone very much decayed. Later on, in stripping the plaster from the walls above the arcade, I discovered plain signs that the pillars and arches had once been of the same height from the West wall of the Nave to the East wall of the Chancel throughout, and that two had been lowered by truncating the pillars in the Chancel portion. Stones which had been set in over the

original position of the more Western of these two arches showed the curve of their original setting, and the more clearly so because of their having been hacked away to bring them nearer to the upright on the south side of the portion which still leans. These traces were clear when I left. I do not know whether they now appear, or are hidden behind new organ pipes. This discovery led me to scrutinize the arch stones and spandrils of that lowered arcade carefully, and I was able to discover that the arch stones had been pieced, and that the capital of the middle pillar, especially, showed re-working in its top mouldings. In the spandrils and wall above I found on the chantry side, stones that had been moulded inserted as ordinary building material; pieces of old arch stones I found them to be, portions of capitals of responds and old windows also. I merely probed, took their evidence, and left them further undisturbed. But the conclusion was obvious, taken in connection with the evidence of truncation of the pillar and responds of the portion of the arcade between Chancel and Chantry, and the disappearance of the Chancel arch, which no doubt opened out disastrously because of the leaning of that pier, and was taken down. This 16th century re-built Chancel was longer by about one foot than the present one of 1854, for I found a portion of its South wall above the respond in the East gable of this Chancel evidently *in situ*. And it was not so high; for in repairing that South wall over the arches I came upon a portion of the "rough-cast" outer wall of the chantry and the bottom of the old channel between the two roofs.

In the South (Aisle) wall, which bulged badly in the interior, and had been inefficiently made up, I discovered behind the plaster the remains of the arch which presumably marks the founder's tomb. This I repaired, and underneath it placed pieces found in the East Chancel wall, used as building material, of the 16th century East window of the Chancel. The bracket below the niche represents a bracket of the same section, which had been hacked away; its fitting and cramps joining it to the sill are evident. No trace of stoup existed. The piscina in the Chantry had been

buried under Roman cement, forming a shelf; this I carefully repaired, and the repair also is evident. Its arch had been partially built in inside the re-constructed East wall. I merely opened it out, and, to keep it open affixed over a small recess one of the 14th century carved stones which had been exposed in the porch. The North side of the pier, where the respond of the Chancel arch had been removed, had to be re-faced; the south side is as it was.

The North wall of the Tower had been partially re-built, and the foliation of the capital partially buried in the process. The re-building must have been before the North-East buttress was constructed, and is accounted for by the traces of settlement above the arch and the leaning outwards of the North respond. I merely cleared the foliation by a slight recessing of the wall at that part.

Clearing away the internal plaster gave help in showing the history of the fabric. The West respond of the Nave Arcade was found to show a straight joint all the way up against that of the Tower; and probing showed that it had no tie below the level of the capitals. Moreover, I found that the lower part of that Tower respond was built in to a depth of nine inches inside the West Nave respond, and, higher up, that, built in it to the distance of 16 inches from the North face, was a portion of plastered wall. I did not follow this further. It was evidence of a Nave West wall existing before the Arcade was built. I could get light enough to see this, but not to scrutinize the marks made by the mason's tools at the back of the pillar stones. This I did by means of putty squeezes on the Tower side and on the Arcade side. The result was a revelation. These stones, which could never have been touched since their first erection, showed tool marks essentially different in character. The one sort I was able to trace in the fabric of the Tower piers and arch, where they were out of reach; the other I found characteristic of the Nave Arcade and the South Aisle, except where signs of later disturbance were clear. I took careful rubbings and notes of these, and also of those parts where I suspected hacking away.

The earliest tooling was made with a tool that had a long edge—too long for mason's bolster or chisel, and it was worked parallel with the edge of the squared stone. It looked like hatchet work. This tooling is found also in the fragments of early windows found as building material in the Aisle South wall. The mortar which accompanies the masonry which has this tooling and remains *in situ*, is distinct, good, and sharp. The other seems to be late 12th century work.

The other tooling shows either a notched chisel or a narrow tool, both for clearing; and the rough clearing was done diagonally, not parallel with the sides of the squared stone. In facing, after clearing, the tool was worked from the squared side, but not seldom the marks of the clearing tool were not all cleaned away, and in the portions not intended to show were not cleaned away at all. The mortar which accompanies this masonry is made of the local gravel, is yellowish, and is not so hard as the earlier mortar. The masonry thus characterised belongs to the portions whose architecture is of the 13th century. In that century Thurstan Basset (the last sole owner of Masworth), as witness Bishop Hugh's* *Liber Antiquus*) gave the advowson to Caldwell Priory. The arrangements began in 1215, but the transfer was not effected till 1253. Caldwell was not rich, and when the advowson came into the Priory's possession an attempt was apparently begun to evade the arrangements made.† The Priory was not likely therefore to enlarge the church by the erection of an aisle, and we hear little of what they did all through, except neglecting repair. In these West and South walls where later windows were inserted the marks of the disturbance were clear and the difference of the mortar marked. The one window opening remaining of that date is that of the unfoliated window in the chantry which follows the outward leaning of that wall throughout, and does not project at the upper part as do the Perpendicular windows of that South wall, to keep to the upright. The mortar and the tooling of the Perpendicular windows is different, as is the

* Hugh Wellensis, Bp. of Lincoln.

† Annales de Dunstaple, 1253.

mortar also of the wall above the two easternmost arches of the arcade (16th century work). The tooling of the unfoliated window is the 13th century tooling. Thurstan Basset, I take it, built that aisle, and the Founder's tomb presumably was his.

The tooling of the Nave North windows and the mortar are again different from those of the Tower Arch and Responds, and of the arcade of the Nave. A straight joint also marks the junction of the Nave North Wall and Tower, and there were no marks of disturbance above the windows. The Rood Loft turret, and the difference of the plinth also, are among the signs of a later date for this wall. And reasoning from these, and the traces found when under-pinning, of a Nave North wall which had been further out; and from the fissures, by settlement in the Tower wall above the arch, and from the heavily-constructed buttress, it looks as if there had been collapse and crushing and re-construction. The oldest Nave, before construction of the Aisle, judging from the tale of the arcade stones and the traces found in under-pinning, was some four feet wider than the present Nave. From the portion of a doorway arch found in the rubble of the top of this North wall, when I raised the roof, it would seem as if the rebuilding had taken place when the Decorated style was merging into the Perpendicular. I fixed it in the Tower where the gallery had been. It has ball flower and four leaved flower both. The present Perpendicular doorway may have replaced it, or it may have been an old priest's door where the rood turret is now.

Of the Decorated period few traces exist. The carvings already mentioned and the portion of tracery found embedded as material in the 1854 East Chancel wall which I completed to form a window near the reading desk are nearly all. The Tower lights are later than the fabric, as is its battlement. The put-log holes discovered I left apparent for the very interest they give. The Chantry ceiling is, I understood, 19th century work of about 1860. The earliest traces of the mason's drag, but of a tool much finer in teeth than the usual drag, I found shown by the



MASWORTH.
SHOWING MR. RAGG'S ALTERATIONS.

rubblings of the Perpendicular window toolmarks which I took. Some of the pillars and caps have 19th century drag marks—but they are none of mine.

I ought to add that all work to the fabric of the Chancel was entrusted to me by the Bursar of Trinity College, the late Dr. W. Aldis Wright.

All this is but a record and bare outline: the reasons for the work and the reasonings by which it was carried through, and the plain deductions which careful probing led to. The work of 25 years of one who was observing and learning all the time cannot all be compressed into a few pages. The result is tantamount to this: the church which in its 19th century disguise gave the impression of a Perpendicular Church, scarcely interesting, is revealed as an originally Early English fabric, Tower and Nave and Chancel repaired, enlarged, and partially re-built at different later times, which from its own stones can now reveal its own growth. If I adorned the 19th century portions and repaired the mutilations of its older parts, I did what I could to let the process be clear. Conservation for use in the living Church of England is what I believe in. When our churches are merely unused relics of a lost religion their mutilations may perhaps be left untouched. But nature will then robe the mutilations with her garb of lichen moss and flower.

Description of what the Church was when I left in 1906:—

Early 19th = repairs of 1828.

Mid 19th = repairs of 1854—60.

Late 19th = my own work.

EXTERIOR.

Tower: Fabric mostly late 12th century, upper lights 14th—15th; West window tracery mid 19th; door 15th (?), repaired mid 19th; Battlement, 15th, covered with cement early 19th; repairs to corners, weatherings, and buttresses, late 19th; N.E. buttress, 14th—15th; others, late 12th.

Nave: North wall, 14th—15th; in the upper portion refaced late 19th; repairs of windows late 19th; carvings, stringcourse, and completion of turret.

late 19th; Battlement, early 19th, repaired and replaced late 19th, with slight alterations.

Vestry: Mid 19th, repaired and altered late 19th.

Chancel: Fabric, 1854; N.E. window, 1854; N.W. window a 14th century fragment utilised and completed and set in, late 19th; carved corbel, 14th century; E. window, late 19th; West gable and cross, late 19th.

Chantry: E. wall and window opening (a re-setting), mid 19th; tracery, late 19th; S. wall, Perpendicular window, 14th—15th, renewed at glass line late 19th; unfoliated window, restoration in Bath stone of 13th century original, in late 19th; stringcourse, parapet and carvings, late 19th.

S. Aisle: Wall, 13th century, re-faced late 19th; buttresses, late 19th; window, 14th—15th century, renewed at glass line late 19th; outer mouldings of doorway, mid 19th; battlements, early 19th, repaired and slightly altered late 19th; stringcourse, late 19th; W. window, 14th—15th century, repaired late 19th.

INTERIOR.

Tower: Arch and doorways, late 12th century; fabric, where disturbed for gallery, repaired late 19th; floor and screen, mid 19th; walls, except on North, late 12th century; North wall, in part, 14th—15th.

Nave: North wall, 14th—15th century; vestry doorway, 15th (?); ceiling, late 15th containing early 19th century repairs; rood loft doorways, and stairs, 14th—15th century, repaired late 19th; windows, 14th—15th, nearly entire; walls, heightened late 19th; S. wall, except at top, 13th century; floor tiles, mid 19th, re-laid late 19th; pulpit base, 14th century carving utilised; front rail of pulpit, portion of 13th century screen found used as joist in the old Church House and utilised—both in late 19th; pier of Chancel and Nave Arcade repaired late 19th.

Aisle: W. and S. walls chiefly 13th century. The corner stones had evidently been used before; one of them has a figure on it, which is now inverted. Inner doorway 13th century; jambs of niche 15th (inser-



MASWORTH.
INTERIOR AFTER RESTORATION.

tion); arch of niche, 17th century; bracket restoration, late 19th; windows, 14th—15th century, repaired a little late 19th; S. wall repairs, late 19th; Founder's tomb (?) archway, 13th century, repaired late 19th; tracery under this, 16th century; font bowl, 14th century, from Shenfield, Essex, a discarded Font presented by the late Canon Quennell, to replace the 19th century Font now erected in St. Martha and St. Mary, a new church, Tring; pedestal of font, late 19th; arcade and wall above and responds, 13th century, repaired slightly late 19th.

Chantry: Unfoliated window arch, rear arch, and jambs, 13th century; S.E. window, 14th—15th century, partially repaired late 19th; carved corbel (not *in situ*), 14th century; East window tracery, late 19th; ceiling, mid 19th; piscina and credenza (in one), 13th century, repaired late 19th; arcade separating chantry and chancel, lower part 13th, upper part 16th (13th century work re-set), somewhat repaired, late 19th; arch and corbels between S. Aisle and Chantry, late 19th.

Chancel and chantry screens, late 19th, made from oak taken out of buildings existing in the 17th century and portions of old bell hangings, which I renewed. Carved by my wife and me. The rood is made of the only fragment good of the old bell loft floor.

Chancel: N. and E. walls fabric 1854; all facings, carvings, and mouldings, and the arch and corbels, late 19th. Stones of the facings from Tring Church and the outer walls of Masworth utilised, and arcades in them cut by me *in situ*. Reredos formed of alabaster and of marbles brought from Italy by Lady Marion Alford given to me by Earl Brownlow to be used in the church, flanked by the portions of a reredos of about 1860 that were undecayed, with a portion added. Widening and frontage of altar rail step with inserted porphyries late 19th (the porphyries a portion of Lord Brownlow's gift). Tiles as laid in 1854, except those under the altar.

The account is taken from notes which I made during the work and before resignation. I could not trust to memory alone.