

hence not Presbyterian. Neither is it expedient. Sisterhoods, however much they may abound in labours, are in danger of losing sight of their work in their organization, and of usurping a place which the Church alone is intended to fill in the world. The sympathies also of those who form a separate class and community are not so likely to be drawn out towards the true objects of deaconess's care, as are those of one who is not separated from but rather bound to them by her position in society and office in the Church.

Whatever answers may be given to the questions with the consideration of which this article commenced, we trust that it may have the effect of directing attention to female agency in the Church, and of calling some into the field white to the harvest that have been standing all the day idle.

BIBLE NOTES AND COMMENTS.

PSAL. VIII.

The exposition of this Psalm depends on whether the expressions, "man," and "the son of man," are, or are not equivalents. That they are not, but that while "man" represents humanity—the race of man; "the son of man" means the Lord Jesus, with special reference to his human nature, appears from the following considerations:

1. Because, inasmuch as the scriptures are one, and in the later books (notably in the gospels,) this designation is restricted to him, there is a strong presumption that it must be so in the earlier also, a presumption which cannot be set aside in any case, without the clearest evidence.

2. Not only does no such proof exist in any instance, but the object designed in the passages in which the Psalm is quoted in the New Testament, is to show the personal power and glory of the Redeemer, as the reader may see if he examines I Cor. xv. 22-28 and the first chapters of Hebrews.

3. What is alleged in this Psalm of the person spoken of is true absolutely of the Lord and of him alone.

There is no denying that it is so as explained I Cor. xv. 22-28, and it is not easy to see, how, when the Spirit himself has so expounded it in that place, we can suppose that he uses it in a very different meaning in Heb. ii., when we have no strong grounds for this supposition. Let us examine the only grounds and try their strength. 1. It is supposed that if the Lord Jesus is "the son of man" of the Psalm, it could not be said, What is the son of man that thou visitest him? But why not? What claim had he as man to the honour to which he has attained? Is not his union to the Godhead, as real an act of the divine favour, as the kindness manifested to fallen men? And if so, the reason is of no value. But 2. It is objected that the word "Jesus" being introduced into this passage in Hebrews ii. breaks the continuity of it, and shews that the previous part refers to humanity including the Lord, and the latter part—that which follows the introduction of the word Jesus—to the Lord personally. But does the introduction of the word "Jesus" really break up the continuity of the passage in any sense? Is he not "the son of man"? Would the meaning of the passage be really changed—necessarily so—if read, but we see "him," or, we see the son of man made a little lower than the angels? I cannot see how it would be so, and the only reason why the word "Jesus" is used instead, is, to manifest, (not that he is not, but) that he is the son of man,—to lead the Hebrews to see, that what their own great psalmist prophesied, was fulfilled in Jesus, who was made a