

---

Church of S. John the Baptist, Rogston.

BY THE REV. H. FOWLER, M.A.

The history of this Church of S. John the Baptist as a parochial church dates from the Dissolution of the Religious Houses. Before commencing the remarks which I have to offer I will say, that I am indebted for

my materials mainly to the County Histories and a few other well-known Archæological works. I have also to express my obligation to the Vicar for kind facilities, and to Mr. H. J. Thurnall, of Royston, for valuable information most courteously supplied. As a stranger to this part of the county, even with their helps, I cannot hope to do more than point out some of the leading features in the history of a building which has undergone successive alterations rather puzzling to Archæologists, but all the more interesting on that account.

At this spot we are, I believe, in Hertfordshire, in the Ancient Hundred of Odsey, not many yards from the old British track of the Icknield Way, which at this point is identical with Melbourn Street, and passes along westward in the line of Baldock Street; it intersects, as you are aware, the Roman military road of Ermine Street, at the point where the Ancient Cross stood, and is here the boundary line between this county and Cambridgeshire. Ermine Street appears to have given its name to the adjoining Hundred of Armingford (quasi 'Erminford'), in Cambs.

Previously to the institution of the Vicarage here in 1540, we are told the town was situated in five parishes—three in Cambs., viz., Bassingbourn, Kneesworth, and Melbourn, and two in Herts, viz., Therfield and Barkway. I am not sure whether all these met at the Ancient Cross. Camden says, "there touche in that towne jurisdiction of London, Ely, and Lincolne diocese." In early Saxon times the Cave, with perhaps a cross above it, might have marked a point in the boundary between the Mercian and East Saxon kingdoms. It is not very easy to picture to ourselves the state of things here, when, at the dissolution of the Priory of Austin Canons, the parish first came into existence. We are informed that on the 29th December, 1539 (which was the morrow of the Festival of the Patron Saint of the house), the site of the Priory, with all its demesnes, constituting the present Manor of Royston, was granted to Robert Chester, of Barkway (then esquire, but shortly afterwards knighted), for the sum of £1,761 5s., equivalent perhaps to about £14,000 of present money. This Sir Robert had before this time become possessed of a part of the Fee of Newsells,

in Barkway, which had been the patrimony of the Scales family, and the De Veres. He was certainly a man of importance, and he now acquired the estates of Cockenhatch, Rokey and Nuthamstead (or Northampstead), in Barkway, and, I suppose, also the various lands in Cambs., with which the Monastery had been endowed. This wealthy knight is an interesting person to us archæologically, because he probably had much to do with the alterations now made in the Priory Church. The Chester family appears to have resided chiefly in Barkway, I suppose at Newsells Bury; there are several of their memorials in Barkway Church. Sir Robert Chester, however, certainly built a large residence here, called the Priory House, in which perhaps were incorporated the Prior's Hall and other portions of the Monastery. It is described in a report of the Commissioners of Queen Elizabeth as a large irregular Mansion, having an outer and an inner court, and sixteen rooms on the ground floor. The Queen contemplated making a stay here in a progress through the county in July, 1578, but was deterred by the unfavourable report of the building.

In 1563 the wife of Sir Robert Chester was buried in this Church, as we gather, not from the parish registers (which, for burials, date from 1678), but from "Machyn's Diary." The account is as follows:—"In 1563, the 26th day of Marche, was bered the good lade Chastur, at Royston, the wyff of Sir Robartt Chastur, knyght, with a pennon of armes and iii. dosen of skochyons and a vi. of bokeram, and the chyrche hangyd with blake and armes, and Master Somersett was the harold, and there was many mornars in blake, and gret mon mad for her, and a sarmon [Forentine Stevenson was then Vicar], and a gret dole of money, and mett and drynke, and after a grett dinner."

There appears to be no monument of this lady remaining, but I understand there are some Chester tablets on the north wall of the chancel.

We will glance at the Monastic Buildings presently. Dr. Stukeley tells us that in his time a fine kitchen was still standing and other ruinous parts. The old wall of the precinct still remains, I believe, almost entire; it encloses the beautiful Priory grounds and the modern house of Lord Dacre, which is said to stand on the site of the Monastic barn.

It was in the old Priory House that King James I. was the guest of Robert Chester, son of the first Sir Robert Chester, in April, 1603, on his way from Scotland to be crowned in England, when he was so much delighted with the beautiful Royston downs, that he determined to build the hunting box, a portion of which is said to exist in Kneesworth Street. I must say, however, that there is nothing Jacobean in the appearance of this house now.

If the Cave was filled up and closed at the dissolution of the Monastery, it was probably done by the direction of Sir Robert Chester, in whose Manor it was situated. It appears he died between 1563 and 1565; in the latter year his son, "Robert Chester, Esq., of Royston," was High Sheriff of Herts. For about two centuries the family were prominent in the county, and appear in the roll of High Sheriffs up to the year 1747. They also were patrons of this Vicarage, and that brings us back to the church.

It seems that in Monastic times the inhabitants of Royston had the privilege of worshipping in the western portion of the Church of the Augustinian Canons. The antiquary Leland (writing soon after 1540) says, "In the towne is but one churche, the este part whereof servid a late for the Priory of Chanons. The west end servid for a chapel for the town." This statement clearly conveys two facts,—1st, that the church consisted mainly of two members—the eastern, which contained the choir of the canons—and the western—in fact, the nave, which was used as a chapel or church of the laity. This was by no means an uncommon arrangement in the Conventual Churches: at S. Albans and at Dunstable it was an aisle of the nave or chapel annexed to it, which was so used. Although there was no Vicar here, there was probably a chaplain or parson deputed by the Prior to minister to the townsmen. When the Religious House was surrendered, and the Prior and Canons, I suppose, pensioned off, the fabric of the church was reserved to the King; and to the honour of the inhabitants it is placed on record that they purchased it at considerable cost for their Parish Church. The Act of Parliament by which the vicarage was constituted in 1540, says:—"The church of which Priory the poore inhabitauntis of the saide towne have bought to

their great charges to thintente to have the same their Parrish Church, and therein to have daily masse and other Divine services to be celebrated and done."

It states that the "church shall be henceforth called the church of Saint John the Baptist in the towne of Royston." It provides that a parcel of ground adjoining shall be inclosed for a burial ground, and that the town shall constitute one parish. It also speaks of the town as a great thoroughfare and having an important weekly market. It is not very easy to reconcile the expression, "the poore inhabitauntes," with the description given of the town; but if the inhabitants were poor, so much the more honour to them that they saved the church and secured it for parochial worship "at their great charges." If we are to assume that Royston was a poor town in the monastic days, it must have made great advances in prosperity, to all appearance, since; and to assure ourselves of the liberality of the present generation of parishioners in respect to their Parish Church we have only to look around.

The King appointed the first Vicar, Alexander Stooks; he may have been the priest who previously ministered to the inhabitants. We are reminded by the wording of the "Act," that the Reformation, as far as doctrine was concerned, had not yet taken place. In the previous year the Statute of the vi. articles had been passed; and the Vicar was required to celebrate daily mass. The county historians make no mention of an endowment or of a Vicarage house, such provisions were too frequently overlooked in the property arrangements at the suppression of the monasteries. The early vicars here must have been greatly dependent for subsistence upon the offerings of the "poor inhabitants." In 1650 the Commissioners appointed to make a valuation of benefices reported this Vicarage to be of the annual value of £5; and it is not very surprising to hear that it was then "destitute of a minister for want of maintenance." The only church furniture assigned for the use of the first Vicar consisted of "one chalice of silver, weighing vi. oz., a cope of black camlet, and a vestment, with an albe, of black chamlet"; there were also four bells in the steeple; now, I believe, there are six. The provision for a churchyard is spoken of in the Act of Parliament. Judging from the somewhat narrow limits

which exist at present, it would seem not to have been enlarged. But, if the burial ground is small now, what must it have been when the nave and transepts of the Monastic Church, to say nothing of a lady-chapel and other adjuncts were standing. It seems highly probable that we have here an explanation of the removal of these portions of the ancient church, or at least one reason for their destruction. But however this may be, there can be little doubt that the church once had a nave, and that the existing tower was a central one, having the usual adjuncts, transepts.

I have already quoted the authority of Leland, who says of the church, "the west ende is pulled downe," and we have the evidence of the existing canopied recess in the wall now separating the Priory garden from the churchyard westward of the tower. That niche, we are informed by Wever, contained in his time (temp. Charles I.) a recumbent effigy, which Mr. Cussans informs us has since been removed into the church, and now lies at the east end of the south aisle. Wever's quaint words are—"In a ruinous wall of the decayed Priory lies the proportion of a man cut in stone." This wall then, with its monumental canopy, was clearly once a wall of the Conventual Church; from its position it must have belonged either to the south aisle of the nave, or to a chapel extending westward from the transept. The latter supposition is very improbable, because transeptal chapels always extended eastward. Clutterbuck informs us that a large arch walled up was formerly to be seen on the western face of the tower, indicating that the church extended westward; that arch must, of course, have opened into the nave. I say, of course, for this further reason, that a Priory Church without a nave would be an anomaly; and the nave was certainly not on the eastern side of the tower, for there is only space here for the choir. It is by no means uncommon to find that one of the limbs has disappeared, where a Conventual Church has become parochial. At Dunstable, as we have seen, the eastern portion has been pulled down (or allowed to become a ruin and then cleared away), and the nave preserved. At Hexham, the nave has been taken down, and the eastern arm, with the tower and transepts in that instance retained, and other examples might be quoted.

I conclude, then, that the original Priory Church consisted of a choir, with aisles, a sacarium or chancel, and a central tower, all which (in their altered condition) we see; and transepts and a nave with a south aisle, which we do not see. We observe the tower has been transformed by its recent flint casing (covering the decayed clunch) into a good Decorated tower with western entrance. The ancient oak door, with its good Perpendicular tracery and ponderous lock and key, may have been taken from the west end of the nave of the Conventual Church. The internal eastern arch has been altered in Perpendicular times (as we see by its form and mouldings), but that the tower is substantially an Early English work may be inferred from this consideration. The western arch of the south arcade abuts against it. This arch, which is different from every other in the church, has distinctly Early English mouldings (consisting of bold rounds and deep hollows), the wall of the tower therefore, against which it abuts, cannot be later than the Early English period; and as this side of the tower has not been taken down since the date of that arch, the probability is that the whole tower is structurally Early English.

Before proceeding further with the architectural features of the church, it will be convenient to refer to the origin of the Priory, to which the church belonged, and first as to its dedication. In the oldest extant Charter—that of Richard I., dated Nov. 10. A.D. 1189 (given by Dugdale in the “*Monasticon*”)—it is styled simply that of S. Thomas, the Martyr; but on a seal of Prior Osbert (temp. Henry III.) two Patron Saints are depicted, standing on either side of a cross (presumably the “*Crux Rohesiæ*”), viz., S. John the Baptist on the dexter, and S. Thomas à Becket, on the sinister; and the legend, as interpreted by the antiquary Parkin, is “*Sigillum Prioris et Conventus Sanctorum Johannis et Tomæ Martiris de Cruce Roheys.*” This shows that the church was dedicated to these two saints conjointly. At the dissolution, as we should have anticipated, the name of S. John the Baptist alone was retained. Mr. Cussans gives the date of the foundation, c. 1180, shortly after the canonization of the martyred Archbishop, when great enthusiasm for his honour was displayed.

The Charter I have mentioned confirms "to the Monastery of S. Thomas, the Martyr, at Roise's Cross ('apud crucem Rohesiæ'), and to the Canons there serving God, the site of the monastery with its appertinances, which Eustache de Merc, the founder, Ralph Roucester, and other faithful men have reasonably granted to them." Eustace de Merc, or Merch, perhaps derived his name from March, or Marsh, a town in the Isle of Ely. Nothing seems to be known of him except that he was lord of Nucells, and possessed lands in Barkway (Manor of Cokenhatch), which had been owned by Rohesia de Vere (foundress of the Gilbertine Priory of Chicksand), who is supposed to have rebuilt the Cross which gives its name to the locality. [The late Mr. Joseph Beldam, however, in his exhaustive treatise, attributes this to her ancestor of the same name.] That Eustace de Merc was devoted to the memory of S. Thomas, of Canterbury, we cannot doubt, for he named his Augustinian Priory after him, and gave lands to endow it. His nephews, William and Ralph, of Rochester, and various other benefactors successively added to this endowment. The Charter of Richard I. enumerates 14 grants of land, chiefly in Cambs., also three churches in Cambs.—Cottenham, Chesterton, and Aurisbeia, which, I suppose, must be Ambridge. Two ladies are among the grantors, Juliana and the Countess Margaret. All these personages are supposed by Dr. Stukeley to be depicted in the Cave. There can be little doubt, I imagine, that the Monastery and the Cave were closely associated: perhaps some pilgrim from Palestine had established himself here in the time of Eustace de Merc, and the fame of the Hermitage influenced the latter in his choice of the site for the Monastery. Among the grants are three acres of land close to the Cross ("tres acras terræ proximas Cruci Rohesiæ"), given by Waren de Bassingbourne. Most of these grants are very small, that of Bishop Osbert being one acre in Meldeburne or Melbourn. We learn from the "Annales de Burmundseia," that in 1189 Richard Norman, Prior of that Monastery, granted to the Prior of Royston, land in Cokenage (Cokenhatch) in fee-farm, for an annual payment of 13s. 4d. This land had been given to the monks of Bermondsey by William Revel, A.D. 1169. (Annales Monastici, Rolls

Series, Vol. iii. pp. 443 and 447.) In the taxation of Pope Nicholas IV., A.D. 1291, are named lands in Berkway, Bokland (Buckland), Est Rede, and Crux Rosia; the whole being rated at £35 6s. 9d. No unimportant part of the endowment were the tolls of the annual fair, lasting the whole of Whitsun week (in which a large amount of business was doubtless transacted), and the weekly market on Wednesday, held at the Cross; the customs being the same (the Charter states) as those granted to the Canons of Dunstable. As the temporalities were not large in amount, so Camden and other writers speak of the Monastery "as a little one." Both these considerations may have some weight in tracing the connection of the present building with the Priory.

We will now look at the features of the church as they exist. If a church was erected in the time of Eustace de Merc, c. 1180, it must have been in the Semi-Norman or Transitional style. No traces of that style are to be seen here. The earliest architectural features visible are developed Early English. I refer to the beautiful lancet windows in the chancel, which I suppose are not earlier than 1220; the Early English arch abutting against the tower (now seen above the gallery) may be contemporary with these lancets. That wall of the tower, as I have before mentioned, must, from structural reasons, be of the same period; so we have Early English work at both ends of the existing fabric. This may be taken as fair evidence that the whole of this eastern member of the Conventual Church (constituting the present parochial church) was once an Early English building. The question then arises, are these portions of the earliest church erected, or not? It seems very improbable that the original structure would have been pulled down or transformed within about 40 years of its erection. As the first endowments were small, it is probable that the building of the church was delayed for some years, while the domestic edifices of the Priory were being completed. The plan may have been laid out and the foundations commenced at the end of the reign of Henry II., but the funds may not have served to carry up the walls and arcades till the first years of Henry III. Perhaps the exactions for the ransom of Richard I., and the troubles of John's reign, may partly account for this. It seems the most reason-

able supposition that we see here some features of the first church ever erected on this site. We observe that the *sacrarium* was originally lighted by a group of three lancets on each side. All archæologists must view with great satisfaction the discovery and careful preservation of these exquisite remains during the recent works of restoration. The two western lights on the south side have been cut into by an alteration (made at the beginning of the Perpendicular period), when arches were opened in the chancel walls. On the north side the easternmost lancet is now opened internally to the sill, and shows the graceful proportions of the design. Fragments of the shafts were found (as I have been informed by Mr. H. J. Thurnall) embedded in various parts of the walls of Elizabethan work. A part of the Early English "string," which formed the lower termination of the windows externally, may be seen in the south wall on the outside. We observe in the alteration on the south side the arch was built without disturbing the upper part of the structure; the shafts and head mouldings of two lancets appear rising in a picturesque manner above the crown of this arch. We are grateful to the Perpendicular builders for having left them to tell their tale; but it is not at all likely that they intended them to be seen; the upper surface of the hood of the arch was evidently never meant to be exposed (as Mr. Keyser has pointed out), and was doubtless embedded in the wall, as were the heads of the lancets. This appears to have been a favourite method with Mediæval builders; they were very skilful in supporting old work while making alterations, and the method was most likely adopted as the most convenient, and not because they cared about preserving old features. The way in which the work was done may have been this. First, the lancets were carefully walled up, so as to form an even surface; then the arch was marked out upon this surface, and each stone of the new work was inserted severally in a cavity prepared for it, till the whole arch with its responds was completed, and then the wall beneath it was removed. I am indebted for this suggestion to an architectural friend present—Mr. S. F. Clarkson.

The western limit of the Early English sanctuary is marked by the massive pier next to the present chancel

—that is, in fact, part of the wall of the original chancel, with a respond formed on each side of it. The chancel arch was there. Mr. Cussans tells us that the bases of its piers were found when the old pews were taken down. This arch probably existed till the alteration of the north arcade. And here would have been the chancel screen up to the time of the dissolution. The opening of the side arches in the sacarium of course had a purpose; this was probably to give communication with the side chapels, which were now formed by extending the aisle eastward to the present limits. We may be quite sure that the Mediæval Canons would never have been satisfied with a sanctuary of the present dwarfed proportions; in fact, their ceremonial would not have admitted of it. The removal of the chancel arch prevents us from realising the ancient arrangement, but my conviction is, that the limits of the sanctuary were not diminished by the architectural alterations, which are due to the extension of the aisles. The situation of the ancient piscina and credence shows that the high altar was in about the position of the present altar-table. The Early English chancel would no doubt have had a group of lancets in the east wall. After the alteration, which was probably made at the beginning of the reign of Richard II., there would have been screens in the lateral arches. We are informed that the beautiful oak Perpendicular carving of the pulpit has been taken from the screen on the south side. There would have been in the sanctuary a reredos and a reliquary, wooden sedilia and rich hangings, and probably effigies of the Patron Saints—certainly one of S. Thomas, of Canterbury. A mutilated statuette of an ecclesiastic (habited in eucharistic vestments), now in the museum of the Royal Institute, may possibly be this effigy. The original Early English aisles, of course, could not have extended further eastward than the chancel arch, otherwise they would have cut off the light from the lancet windows. When the aisles were lengthened, the easternmost bays probably formed chapels containing tombs of benefactors, and altars.

We have now to look at the choir. The structural choir, of course, extended from the pier, against which the chancel arch abutted, to the tower, thus consisting

of three bays. There is now no difference between the level of its roof and that of the sacrarium, but there would have been originally. The present roof was probably put on when the north arcade was rebuilt; its wall-pieces come down over the hood mouldings of some of the lancets. The external aspect of the building gives one the idea that the clerestory has been cut off. As this Priory was a small one, the choir proper, that is the space in which the Canons' stalls were arranged and the daily offices were sung, is not likely to have extended under the tower. I believe the massive pier on the south side next the tower marks its western limit. It supports the Early English arch, and its masonry must be of the same period, although it has undergone alterations. Its massiveness certainly suggests that it was designed to give support to the rood-loft, and that the rood-screen was placed here, just where the front of the gallery now is. There probably was a similar massive pier on the north side to correspond, to which the stair of the rood-loft was attached. The entrance would be under the rood, in the usual position, and the western bay would be the vestibule. The stalls would range on each side against the piers of the arcade, with a light screen behind them, and return-stalls at the west end under the rood. The length of these two bays is, I believe, about 30 feet, and if we plan it out, we shall find there would be room for about twelve stalls (in a single row) on each side, and perhaps six return-stalls, making thirty in all. We may infer from these structural considerations, with some degree of probability, that the number of Canons in this house did not exceed 30. The seat of the Prior would be, of course, the return-stall next the entrance on the south side. I have made a rough plan to illustrate these ancient arrangements.

To return for a moment to the matter of the clerestory. In the Early English times, the eastern lancets of the chancel could not have thrown much light into the choir on account of the chancel arch, and the meagre amount of light which could be derived from the few lancets in the aisles would be obstructed by the choir screens above the stalls, a clerestory therefore would have been necessary to give light to the choir; and we may safely infer that the Monastic Church had a clerestory, and

that its roof rose above that of the chancel. The tower, being refaced, now gives us no clue, but I think Mr. Thurnall has informed me there was such a clue formerly.

We will now look at the south arcade of the choir. I have spoken of the masonry of the massive westernmost pier; its two responds have both been altered since the date of the circular western arch, which it upholds; the eastern respond appears to be of advanced Early English character, having a remarkably bold engaged *keel* shaft inserted between the round members. The next pier eastward is of the same type, and although new in appearance is, I suppose, a reproduction of the old work. The respond, which was originally next to the chancel arch, is also of the same pattern. This seems to indicate a remodelling of these two bays towards the end of the reign of Henry III. (c. 1260). But when we look at the mouldings of the arches which rest upon these piers, we find they do not agree in character with the piers; the western is Decorated work, the eastern either Late Decorated or Early Perpendicular. These successive alterations are very remarkable, and difficult to account for. They were probably effected without disturbing the wall above. The mouldings of the caps of the piers would seem to have been altered at these periods—that is, if we can rely upon them as old work. The responds of the round westernmost arch appear to have been also remodelled in the Decorated period; these exactly resemble the Decorated pier on the north side. Mr. Keyser informs me that it is a type frequently found in Cambridgeshire. Piers of this character also existed in Therfield Church. The beauty of the south arcade is a striking contrast to the meagre Elizabethan work opposite. The north arcade was perhaps once all Decorated work. A good Decorated arch is seen in the wall of the north aisle, the admirable modern carving of the corbels from which it springs is well worthy of close inspection. This must have opened into a side chapel; probably the Lady Chapel was here, extending eastward, with its south wall in the line of the present aisle wall. A Lady Chapel is sometimes found in such a position—on the north side of the choir. It is very possible that the removal of the chapel here damaged

the eastern parts of the aisle, and was in some degree the cause of the reconstructions on this side of the church in the Elizabethan period. The arch, I have spoken of, is perhaps the only feature of the Monastic Church preserved on this side. We observe, however, two very interesting medallions of ancient stained glass, which, I understand, have been removed from a more eastern window. Whether some of the good modern windows have replaced Elizabethan work, I am unable to say. With reference to the Lady Chapel, I may mention that in the Museum I have alluded to, there is a beautiful statuette of the B. Virgin (mutilated), which no doubt belonged to a niche in the Monastic Church.

When the north arcade was rebuilt, the remains of the western chancel lancet on this side disappeared. The westernmost respond of this arcade has on its cap a Renaissance moulding ("the egg and dart"), a similar one was also once to be seen, as I am informed, on the eastern pier; this suits the date assigned to the work—about 1600. There once existed on the plaster partition, with which the tower arch was closed up, an inscription in Latin hexameters; it informs us that in the forty-third year of Queen Elizabeth, A.D. 1601, the inhabitants having obtained possession of this sacred pile, dedicated it to the worship of the Holy Trinity. It concludes with an invocation of blessing upon the memory of all who had any share in the erection of "this noble temple." The verses certainly commemorate the completion of the Elizabethan reconstruction, which must have included the re-roofing of the choir (now the nave) and north aisle. The roof of the south aisle is good Perpendicular work, with bold figure corbels, and was probably erected when that aisle was lengthened.

The existing church seems to possess no original doorway, unless the small one in the south aisle is such, or a restoration. The Canons' entrance was probably in the usual position in the south aisle of the nave. The Monastic cloister usually adjoined that aisle, terminating eastward against the south transept. This transept was generally separated from the chapter-house by a slype; and the dormitory southward of it was connected with the transept by a covered passage carried over the chapter-house. We are unable to say what the arrangements were in this Priory, but I am informed there are

in the south wall some indications of a staircase, which may have led to the dormitory.

The early Priors were probably buried in the chapter-house. Of the later Priors there were formerly two brass memorials in the church; that of John Borugh, who died 26th April, A.D. 1484, and of Robert White, ob. 1st April, 1534. When Cardinal Wolsey rested here in his last journey to the north (Sept., 1530), with a train of 160 horse (as Burnet writes), he was entertained by Prior White, who is thought to have ruled for nearly half-a-century, and to have been the last in authority here. The surrendering Prior, of course, was merely a nominal functionary. The brass of William Tabram, rector of Terfeld (Therfield), dated 1462 (the upper half of which only remains), and the delicate cross in the chancel, ensigned with the five sacred wounds, are very interesting specimens of 15th century memorials.

Time has not admitted of an inspection of other interesting monuments. The beautiful recumbent effigy (to which I have alluded), now placed at the end of the south aisle, is assigned by Mr. Cussans to a member of the family of Scalers or Scales, who once possessed the Manor of Rokey, in Barkway. If we could discover the trace of an *escallop shell* on the tabard, this might be placed beyond dispute. The date of the armour (on Mr. Cussans' authority) would suit Robert, third Lord Scales, who died in 1369; he bore, as did his ancestor at the siege of Caerlaverock, "rouge o cokilles de argent" (a red shield charged with escallop shells of silver). This is the chief archæological treasure of the building.

We may regret that no Monastic "Annales Roystonianæ" exist to throw more light on the architectural history of this interesting church. We learn from Tanner that there were three other Priories of this order in Hertfordshire: the Black Canons of Royston, who sometimes entertained royal visitors, were certainly the most important.

---