

COLONIAL PEARL.

A VOLUME DEVOTED TO POLITE LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND RELIGION.

Published every Friday evening, at 17s. 6d. per Annum.

VOLUME THREE.

FRIDAY EVENING, MAY 31, 1839.

NUMBER TWENTY-TWO.

For the Pearl.

THE ASCENSION.

Oh Bethany, how beautiful art thou!
Thou once pure mountain, but polluted now!
Still cool, and calm, still shadowy and lone,
With myrtles fragrant, and with firs o'ergrown:
Still bright at sun-rise, and at evening wet
With lavish dews from lofty Olivet:
Whose dusky summit overhangs thy hill—
Still more august, and more umbrageous still.
And echoes yet do bound from stem to stem
Of busy voices from Jerusalem.
Is there not one who by the moonlight strays
Through thy dark, branchy, unmolested ways,
Whose scents thy lilies at the clear brook side,
Who loves the tone of thy perpetual glide,
Who feels that God is nearer than before
When, counting thy mysterious ages o'er,
He thinks of what was suffered, what was done
Amid thee Bethany? Not one! Not one!
And yet when God on earth in manhood dwelt
This was the mighty sojourn where he knelt:
This was the ground that bore its Maker's knees,
Beside these waters, and beneath these trees:
This was the loneliness that heard him cry
When silence covered earth, and clouds the sky:
Yet all o'er earth his kindest watch he kept
While many eyes that longed for slumber slept:
And many eyes tho' guilty, yet looked glad
At things they sought to have, and oh, they had—
They had them! yet they urged another tear
Another cry from him that watched them here!
And when mortality no more he knew—
When he had entered death, and passed it thro',
When, like a shadow from his sacred tread
Back to the holy sepulchre it fled,
Then thy Creator thou didst once more see,
Oh beautiful and hallowed Bethany!
Not kneeling, now—abasement no more pressed
Tears from those eyelids, sighing from that breast:
That breast now burns with Godhead, those eyes see
Whathath been, what is, and what shall be.
Yet his mild arms of blessing he outspread
O'er his disciples, o'er each bending head,
That bent adoringly, until a cloud,—
Not filled with lightning, flames, and thunders loud,—
To slay them, but a cloud of ether blue,
Of evening softness, close and closer drew!
It shined the Son of God while standing there:
It rose, and he rose with it thro' the air!
Ten thousand cloud-borne angels near him went,
With harps and songs that shook the firmament!
While all the listening worlds that seemed to be
Like islands, rising from eternity,
Returned the seraph-shouts from their bright shores,
"Lift up your heads ye everlasting doors!
"He comes! the conqueror of human sin:
"He comes! the King of glory enters in.
"He cometh who was born at Nazareth:
"He cometh with the keys of hell and death:
"To scatter torments, and to shed rewards,
"For he is King of Kings, and Lord of Lords!"

Charlotte R.

For the Pearl.

GEOLOGY AND REVELATION.

No. 2.

DR. PYE SMITH'S LECTURES.

THE Fifth Lecture was delivered to an undiminished audience on the evening of Tuesday, March 26. Having read 1 Thess. v. 21, the Rev. Doctor remarked upon the duty of a thorough investigation of the word of God as essential to the great end of our existence; namely, a union with Him. Between the works of nature and the word of God, though there may be apparent discrepancy, there can be no real discordance, since both proceeded from the same hand. We want facts correctly stated. We should study the book of nature as if we had not heard of Scripture, and apply ourselves to the word of God as if the book of nature were not open before us. Adverting to various modes of surmounting difficulties, Dr. S. observed, that the manner in which Dr. BUCKLAND had expressed himself on this subject was much to be regretted; though he was sure that that eminent individual could not have intended all that would naturally be inferred from it. Speaking of some apparent discrepancies, he has this sentiment—That if, in this respect, geology seems to require some concession from Scripture, it may afford to concede something in consideration of the services which geology has rendered to revelation. "We have not," said the Rev. Lecturer, "power to concede anything—truth has nothing to concede." The Scriptures must be carefully and grammatically examined; and, in doing so, he

was aware how much suspicion, disapprobation, nay, *horror*, would be excited in some quarters by fearless and impartial exegeses which might present a deviation from *their interpretation* of Scripture, or from hypotheses of their own, which they had regarded as the only possible solution of difficulties; and, while he could not but respect the motive, and highly esteem many individuals expressing such feelings, he must say that it was too often a "zeal not according to knowledge."

Some feel no difficulty: of geological facts they know little, yet persuade themselves they know enough to judge of the whole matter; and, putting their interpretations in the place of inspiration, reckon it among the highest points of the Christian faith that the first sentence of the Bible is not an independent statement, but forming part of a connected detail of occurrences. And should a doubt of this be expressed, it is not to be met by argument, but to be put down by authority. [Here the Rev. Doctor read an extract from the Rev. H. COLE, which excited no little merriment, and of which it was difficult to say whether it were most distinguished by ignorance of every rule of argument, or dogmatical and vulgar assumption, which forcibly contrasted with the courteous and truly Christian terms in which Dr. SMITH adverted to the writer.]

He must protest first, against the assumption which ran through the whole, and the presumption which regarded the Scriptures and his interpretation of them as identical. On his own behalf, as a humble geologist, he must deny, and he must say indignantly deny, the charge of rejecting the divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, and affirm his utter abhorrence of the thought of mutilating them. Adverting to certain extracts from the Commentary of LUTHER, which Mr. C. had accompanied with an amusing note of exultation, at the exact coincidence of the sentiments of "This blessed man" with his own, the Rev. Doctor said that, while he would not yield to Mr. COLE in admiration and love of that great man, he could not place much dependence on his views of Natural philosophy. He thought it no disparagement to LUTHER that in his commentary on the 5th chapter of Genesis he should have spoken of the atmosphere in terms which every one now knew to be not accordant with fact; that he regarded every star as taking its light from the sun, and as moving with it round the earth. Citing the language of Mr. COLE, the Rev. Doctor exclaimed, "What a faithful, simple, self-evident exposition this good man was inspired to leave to the world!" (Cheers and laughter.) Dr. SMITH then cited a portion of LUTHER's introduction, in which he observed that little more could be known from the scriptures than the general truth that the world had a Divine origin; that they were rather designed to exhibit general principles than minute details. "So wrote the 'blessed man,' and thus laid down the position on which I rest my remarks."

"I likewise protest," said the Rev. gentleman, "against the constant strain of vituperation in which this gentleman speaks of the friends of science. To represent them as open enemies of revelation; is neither just nor wise, and tends to foster in the minds of such as either disbelieve or doubt the Scriptures, a suspicion that they will not bear the test of scientific scrutiny. This is not to be identified with the 'philosophy and vain deceit' which were the subjects of apostolic reprobation: they were the effusions of Oriental fancy, founded, not on observation, but imagination—idle and visionary speculations, destitute of evidence, and having no practical application. The natural philosophy of our own times, was the opposite of this in its constitution and tendency. Searching out the works of God, it admitted nothing as data without ample evidence, and conducted its researches to a practical end. It may be abused—so may any of the gifts of God, which no one would reject on that account. The practice reprobated is a command of God:—'Consider the works of the LORD.'"

"Further, though their interpretations of the word of God must rest on their own evidence, it is useful to know the opinion of sound and judicious critics whose industry and character entitle them to regard. On this ground, and not as placing an absolute reliance on their opinions, I cite some eminent and excellent authors both ancient and modern, who regarded the declaration forming the first sentence of Genesis as announcing a pre-existent order of things; and, however these may differ from each other or from truth, they concur in separating the first from the succeeding statements. Some of the fathers, as CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS and ORIGEN, considered that sentence as referring to matters long before created, out of which the heavens and earth were made. AUGUSTINE represents the original creation thus described as bearing the same relation to the details which follow as

a seed bears to the plant, the trunk and leaves of a tree. BASIL and CHRYSOSTOM lay down the principle; that Moses describes only the sensible appearances of things in language adapted to the knowledge of the Israelites. CALVIN observes of this sentence, that its great design was to establish this truth, that the world was not from eternity, but that it was created by God. And that this was a *grand and independent axiom*. To the same effect were the testimonies of Bishop PATRICK, Dr. JENNINGS, Dr. WARDLAW, and Dr. REDFORD."

The Rev. gentleman then adverted to a publication of the Rev. J. M. BROWN, a clergyman of the Church of England, whom he described as a man of eminent piety and excellence, less vehement than Mr. COLE, but on that account more touching in his censures. He represents "the BUCKLANDS, the SEDGWICKS, and the CONYBEARES" as associated with infidels in undermining the truths of revelation. Like other opponents, he identifies his interpretations with inspired writ. According to this gentleman, our highest notion of creative power is, that of a universe brought into existence in its complete state by the fiat of the moment. The notion of fossils being a sort of mineral creation, found (as we understood) a place in this gentleman's speculations. He also supposes a rapidity in chemical and mechanical forces inconceivably beyond their present character, to account for the various formations of rocks. Granting this however, to the utmost extent, the question relates not to strata only, but to organic remains in them; and the supposition that the various parts of which these remains consist, exhibiting every adaptation of bone and muscle, with internal structure and vehicles of air and food to the obvious wants of the animal, are now in the condition of their first creation, is beyond the range of argument. Let the vast multitude of molluscous and conchiferous shells be examined, and the 4,800 species of fossils; and think whether a notion that so plays into the hands of atheism is worthy to be cherished.

Another of his objections was against the theory of the earth having undergone successive processes of heat and cooling, as placing the inhabitants in continual danger. It may, however, satisfy some to know, that long ago this heat had arrived at the point where the non-conducting power of the earth's crust regulated its permanent temperature, so that in the ordinary course of things a change in temperature would be influenced by the occasions to which it is ordinarily ascribed: that this point was probably reached some time before the creation of man, and was among the arrangements for this comfort. The Rev. Doctor concluded his remarks on Mr. BROWN with deprecating his attempts to smother inquiry.

It was with pain he now felt compelled to advert to a class of geologists not to be ranked amongst unbelievers, who, nevertheless, asserted an actual discrepancy between the facts of science and the statements of revelation. With sentiments of sincere respect for Dr. BABBAGE and Professor POWELL, he could not agree with the former, in supposing that we cannot depend upon our ability to interpret scripture correctly, it having been written in a language the least intelligible of any. Dr. BABBAGE need not have been careful to inform us that he did not understand Hebrew, or he would not have thus spoken of a language distinguished by its simplicity, and to the study of which a knowledge of cognate languages affords great facility.

Nor could he agree with Professor POWELL, who, though he found no difficulty in admitting the intelligible character of Hebrew, yet considered it so highly poetical as to be little relied on in relation to statements of facts. The language of scripture is not generally that of poetry, but of plain, straightforward narrative or precept. A certain dramatic character runs through the whole book in describing the relations of God to man, ascribing to him delight, abhorrence, etc., etc. This mode of expression is obviously adopted in condescension to our capacities, which could make no other subservient to a knowledge of our duty. This principle is sufficient to carry us out of such a difficulty without impugning the narrative of facts. We, equally with him, would deprecate the construction of theories of science out of the scriptures, but feel no need of going to the opposite extreme of supposing them irreconcilably opposed to facts. Let ours be the middle course which neither tortures the scriptures to make them speak the language of science, nor suppresses the facts of nature to meet our interpretations of revealed truth.

On Thursday March 28, the Rev. Doctor resumed, in a Sixth Lecture, his consideration of the various theories by which the difficulties presented by geological facts were met.

A theory was broached about thirty years ago which had many distinguished advocates, among whom were JAMES PARKINSON,