

sion of the Scriptures are translated, almost invariably, *devil*. But that these are different words, and have a very different meaning, is perfectly obvious to all who have taken pains to examine them. *Diabolos* in its literal application, is always in the singular. In a few passages it is used figuratively, and two or three times in the plural. There can be no question but that it refers to the Arch-Apostate. But not so with *daimon* and *daimonion*: these words have an entirely different signification; and by these were persons said to be possessed. "Whether these demons were the spirits of wicked men deceased, fallen angels, or (as was the opinion of some early Christian writers) the mongrel breed of certain angels (whom they understood by the *Sons of God*, mentioned in Genesis vi. 2,) and the *daughters of men*, it is plain they were conceived to be malignant spirits." The strong probability however is that these were the spirits of the wicked, which, after their death, for some reason, were permitted to afflict the living. If the reader then will bear in mind that when he reads of devils possessing any one, that a different word altogether is used to designate them from that which is used when reference is had to him who "abode not in the truth," he will have a less confused view of this subject. Hence in the improved version of the New Testament, the spirits that possessed human beings, the swine &c., are called "*demons*." the translators thought best to give the reader the original term, and the privilege of affixing his own meaning to it.

From these remarks, hastily thrown together, the reader may form some idea of the difference between the scriptural use of the term Devil, Satan &c., and demon, demons &c. But an induction of all the passages where these terms occur, would fully satisfy the most inquisitive mind, that when *diabolos* is used the Arch-Apostate is referred to, either literally or figuratively; and that when *daimon* and *daimonion* are used, that they refer to some kind of an evil spirit that afflicted the ancients. Perhaps one of the benefits that even the ungodly derive from the Saviour is, that they are not now similarly afflicted. But we will not dispute with any one on any of the above points which are most remotely speculative: if any one differs from us, we blame him not.

2. The next point is "Who are these Sons of God?" Above we have remarked that early Christian writers supposed that they were angelic beings; but we have always thought that the good were thus designated; and by the *daughters of men* was meant females conformed to the maxims, pleasures and follies of earth, Good men married ungodly women. The descendants of Seth married the daughters of Cain. Women have more influence over their children than men; and hence the world soon became corrupt.

3. "Where did Cain get his wife?" Not only sons but daughters were born to Adam and Eve (Gen. v. 4). The reader need but to read the account given in the fourth chapter of Genesis, to see that Cain did not go out east of Eden to get a wife. From his own father's family he took one, and then went out not to the land of Nod, but from "the presence of the Lord a vagabond, and dwelt east of Eden." The word *nad* which is here used as a proper name for Nod, may also mean a wanderer, an outcast, a vagabond. And here, by the way, another question occurs. Some remark that if God had put a mark on Cain, he would have been