ther indeed can be.

country, who sent him into the field to feed swine. And so abject was he, so poor, so miserable, that he would fain ted description of our state, as sinners. Did not our first parents demand of God the portion of goods which fell to them? would administer to their gratification. They thought not of God at the time, or their own will was paramount to his: they set their own will above his. "And when the woman saw that the tree was

not fixed upon their proper objects. We viously not theirs, to be employed as do not love God. Till it is changed the they please. They must be employed carnal mind is enmity against God, for for the purposes for which they were it is not subject to the law of God, nei- bestowed, and not in direct opposition to All our desires and the bestower. Man had no right to say, affections are earthward-set upon the because he was created with such and world, or upon sin. We are useless for such faculties: I can employ them as I good. We do not glorify God—the please: I can covet what I please: I grand object for which we were created. can will what I please: I can think and Or, we are like the younger son in act as I please. The moment that a the parable, who demanded of his father thought entered Adam's heart which he the goods that fell to him, and on his re- knew to be contrary to God's will, it ceiving his portion, went into a far coun- should have been discarded. He should try and wasted his substance with riot- have entertained no desire which was ous living. When he had spent all, there contrary to the will or command of God. arose a mighty famine in the land, and The moment that he did so he had sinhe began to be in want. He then went ed, he had fallen. Then he went into a and hired himself to a citizen of that far country-a far country indeed!estranged from God-away from him -as far from God as evil is from good, as alienation is from friendship, have partaken of the very husks which as hatred is from love. He went the swine did eat. Such is no exaggera- into a far country, where he had no master, where he was his own master, where he might do as he liked, where he might follow his own will, where he Did they not exhibit a similar spirit to might gratify his own pleasure, pursue the younger son in the parable? They his own tastes, live for himself, and by claimed a right to use the faculties which himself, "without God in the world". Ah! God had given them, in their own way, this is what man did. "Give me the for their own purposes, for their own portion that falleth to me". Let me use pleasure. They would be as gods, known my faculties as I please. Let me have ing good and evil. They would be in- my own will, my own pleasure. Let no dependent. They would take what restraint be upon my thoughts, my passions, my actions-no parental restraint -no control, whether of a father's love or of a father's authority. And he went his way. He left his father's presence, his father's house, a father's tenderness, good for food, and that it was pleasant and a father's affection-and settled at a to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to distance from his home—at a distance make one wise, she took of the fruit there- from God, and from heaven, and from of and did eat; and gave also unto her the endearments of the Divine love, and husband with her, and he did eat"— the advantages of the divine intercourse There was the demand: "Give me the and counsel and protection. And what portion of goods which falleth to me".— did he do there? What does man now The will of the creature rising superior do as a sinner? He spends his subto the creator—the son wishing to be stance in riotous living—not in a literal independent of the father—striking out sense, but in a spiritual sense—wasting a path of his own, going after his own his faculties, mispending his powers, objects, seeking his own pleasure. Did casting away on the most worthless obthe portion of goods actually fall to him, jects the treasures of his affections-emor did it not depend upon his father's ploying them all on his own selfish or sinwill whether it fell to him or not? In ful gratification. Is it not so? To what one sense the portion did fall to him: the waste are all our powers put? To what goods were his own. In another sense objects are our affections devoted? Is not the portion did not fall to him: the goods self, is not sin in them all? Some may were not his own. Now, exactly so is it go farther than others in sin, in intemwith those faculties and endowments perance, in sensuality, in godlessness—which God has conferred upon his creature and are away from God, and pursutures. In one sense they are theirs, in ing their own objects, gratifying their another they are God's. They are ob- own desires, wasting their powers, their