

weighed only by "them that are perfect." The *second* is, that though others may consider the Gospel to be foolishness, those who have the faculty of estimating it aright see that it is wisdom,—true, divine philosophy. On these two points in their order, I propose, in the sequel of the discourse, humbly relying upon Him whose grace alone can enable us to speak or to hear profitably, to offer some remarks.

I. The first proposition involved in the text is, that in order to judge of the Gospel, men must be PERFECT; not perfect, of course, in the sense of having attained to absolute holiness of character, because none are thus perfect,—“There is not a just man upon the earth that doeth good, and sinneth not,”—but perfect, as possessing the faculty that judges of spiritual things,—a faculty not found in a large class, who therefore may be described as spiritually imperfect.

The word used by our translators does not, perhaps, convey the idea of the original as distinctly as might be wished, yet I do not know another that is preferable. The original expresses strictly the opposite of defect. Whatever is defective in any of its parts is imperfect, and conversely. But an illustration or two will best explain what is meant.

Our first example shall be taken from the human body. An individual may be corporeally imperfect, by being destitute of any of his bodily organs; by wanting, for instance, the sense of sight. A blind man is imperfect, in respect of the power of vision; and in consequence, he is disqualified from forming a proper judgment,—indeed, from judging at all,—about the matters of which the missing sense takes cognizance. His opinion may be valuable on many other points, but of questions of sight he knows nothing; and even when information respecting visible things is