

tem. In particular, it has been set down as unintelligible mysticism, but it can afford to bear the reproach. That it is taught by the apostle in the chapter before us, is, I conceive, beyond fair dispute; and I trust that the manner in which I have illustrated the apostle's statement will assist you in perceiving that there is not any thing in it repugnant to sober reason, or deserving to be called mystical, in an opprobrious sense. If, indeed, mysticism be a name applied to all cases in which it is claimed that one person may have apprehensions inappreciable or incomprehensible by another, we must, according to such a definition, grant our doctrine to be mystical. But what then? Is it therefore untrue, or absurd? Then it will be absurd also for men who enjoy the blessing of sight to talk of their visual perceptions and the emotions attending these, because all this is incomprehensible to the blind. Then it will be absurd for the admirers of a Raphael to talk of their appreciation of his consummate excellence as a painter, because this is incomprehensible to such as are devoid of taste and sensibility in regard to painting. Then, in a word, (to take the example most closely analogous to the one in hand), it will be absurd for men in an ordinary moral state to talk of their intuitive judgment that a particular action is vicious and detestable, because this is incomprehensible to one whose conscience has become blunted and dead, and who, for his part, sees no harm in the action.

I will make only one other remark on this part of my subject; and it is, that as the perfection spoken of in the text, the capacity for judging of spiritual things, depends not upon one's natural intellectual gifts, but upon his being enlightened by the Spirit of God, persons of very ordinary mental powers may discern, and justifiably feel satisfied of the truth of that Gospel which men of lofty and commanding mind despise. Most of you are familiar with the contrast which the poet Cowper draws betwixt that splendid