rest. The fact of the communication of motion from one body to another, is as inexplicable as the communication of divine influences. How, then, can the former be admitted with any face, while the latter is denied solely on the ground of its incomprehensibility?"

Y. It has been objected to the Mosaic chronology, that it fixes the era of creation only about 4000 years earlier than the Christian era ; and against this, evidence has been brought from the chronology of certain ancient nations.

T. The objections drawn from this source have of late rapidly weakened, and are in fact given up by many whose deference to the authority of Scripture is very slight, though but a few years ago nothing was more confidently urged by sceptical writers than the refutation of Moses by the Chinese, Hindoo, and Egyptian chronologies, founded, as it was then stated, on very ancient astronomical observations preserved to the present day. It is, however, now clearly proved, that the astronomical tables, from which it has been attempted to assign a prodigious antiquity to the Hindoos, have been culculated backwards ;* and among the Chinese, the earliest astronomical observation that appears to rest upon good grounds, is now found to be one made not more than two thousand nine hundred years ago.† As for the conclusion drawn from the supposed Zodiacs in the Temples of Esneh Dendara in Egypt, it is now strongly doubted whether the figures represented upon them are astronomical or mythological, that is, whether they are Zodiacs at all. Their astronomical character is strongly denied by Dr. Richardson, a late traveller, who examined them with great care, and who gives large reasons for his opinion. Even if the astronomical character of these assumed Zodiacs be allowed, they are found to prove nothing. M. Biot, an eminent French mathematician,

* Cuvier's "Theory of the Earth." † Ibid.