Long Breach: The Breach. Two fields immed. N.W. of Heath Barn (OM1).

Ell Piece: 250 yds. S.S.E. of Freelands (OM1).

Stockwell Piece: 3 fur. E.S.E. of Freelands (OM1). Stoce-wyll, 'Stake Spring.'

The Belchers: 500 yds. S.S.E. of Freelands (OM1).

Mackerill Close. 1 m. S.E. of Roughdown Farm (OM1).

Cullimore Field: 1/2 m. W.N.W. of Mell Green (OM1).

Crabtree Piece and The Hearn: Immed. E. of Mell Green (OM1). Probably Hyrne, 'corner.'

Gidley Farm (OM1): Gyddan Leah, 'Gydda's Lea.' Cf. Gyddan Denu, 'Gydda's Dean,' of the Leckhampstead charter.

Worm Down: Immed. N.E. of Chapel Wood (OM1).

Upper Barlands, Barlands, Lower Barlands: All on or near E. By. between the tumulus (OM1) and Heath Barn (OM1).

Hailey Copse (OM1): Heg-leah, 'Lea of the Hedge.'

(To be continued.)

## Potes and Queries

## REPLIES.

REPLY TO QUERY (Vol. xxvii, No. 1) re OLD ARMORIAL GLASS WINDOWS.—If it be true, as I am on good authority informed, that James I (not James II) converted that portion of the Upper Icknield Way which runs from Lowbury Hill to what is known as Kingstanding Hill into a race course, and that Kingstanding Hill was the natural grand stand where that monarch and his Court viewed the sport, there can be little doubt that there was a Royal residence somewhere handy. Might this have been at Foxhill Farm, Didcot—a quite convenient spot—where the diamond-shaped panes of glass with the Rose of England and the Thistle of Scotland, now in the Board Room at Paddington, were discovered?—Wyfold Court, 18th March, 1923.

From whom did the Government purchase the land upon which the Royal Military College, Sandhurst, is built?—Miles, c/o Editor.

## Hoy on Ancient Buildings,

We are requested to call attention to the following letter from Sir Thomas Jackson, Bart., R.A.

SIR,—May I be allowed to add my protest to those that have already appeared in your columns against the extravagant encouragement of creepers on old buildings? Oxford, as your correspondents point out, has suffered from this fashion seriously, many of its architectural features being disguised by ivy and Virginia creeper, so that their details are indistinguishable.

But besides the impropriety of hiding what was meant to be seen, I would insist on the mischief which vegetation may do, and does in many cases, to old walls. Ivy is perhaps the most dangerous, if the most beautiful, of the enemies to be guarded against. It finds its way into the smallest crevice, spreads inside, eats out the mortar, replaces it by a layer of vegetable mould, and by its growth disturbs the construction. I have heard of harm being done in the same way by Virginia creeper, though I have not observed it myself. Smaller vegetation, which might be thought harmless, will also work ruin: wallflowers, and even such small herbs as pellitory, will pull masonry to pieces. I remember having to reset nearly the whole facing of the tower of Christchurch Priory, which had been forced off its bed an inch or more by small herbs of apparently the most innocent character, while in other parts of the building large cavities had been formed and filled by brambles and other vegetation of a larger growth. I remember, when repairing the steeple of St. Mary's Church at Oxford, finding a young elder and a small mulberry growing in the joints of the masonry, which are now flourishing in my Nothing can resist the disruptive force of vegetation garden. in stonework.

There is no reason why the banishment of these dangerous growths need strip our walls bare. They can be decked with roses, jessamine, wistaria, and a hundred other climbing plants that do no harm, and admit of training and trimming, so as not to disguise or hide what one would wish to leave exposed to view.—Your obedient servant,

THOMAS G. JACKSON.