growth of the tree, the more firm and compressed its texture, and the more weighty, strong, and durable, the timber.

Hence the Roman Oracle Vitruvius, and his successor Palladio, and other practical men in those days, who were well acquainted with these facts, confirmed this opinion, by estimating the Oak's growth, perfection, and decay, in those parts, to be an hundred years for each article. Ah! say some (to whom the words of Alexander Pope will justly apply), we know better than the ancients; for

We think our fathers fools, so wise we grow;
Our wiser sons, no doubt, will think us so.

But the author has, in the course of his short experience of thirty-three years in the science of Architecture, abundantly witnessed the timber in many antique buildings corroborating the above estimates to their fullest extent.

Therefore, if we wish to reconcile the great difference existing between the experiments of the celebrated characters first mentioned, the author knows of no other method than to conclude, that when Duhamel informs us that an inch bar of oak 3 feet long would carry no more than 131 pounds without breaking, that it must have been of such timber as grew in a very light sandy soil, and, being half smothered with the branches of other trees, it was impossible that the strength thereof could be equal to those in a more open situation.

And as to Belidor's experiments on pieces of oak of the same size which bore 56 pounds more each, we must naturally suppose that his timber grew in a more favourable situation to the former.

But when we come to the experiments of an Emerson, where he tells us, that a bar of oak 3 feet long, by one