

blatant Irishmen.' He then invited bids for the 'lot.' In the result, £2,000 being the highest bid made, the auctioneer announced the withdrawal of the property. He added that he should shortly offer another advowson, by order of the Court of Chancery, and intending interrupters of the proceedings had better beware, lest they found themselves committed for contempt of court. No doubt he would receive on the morrow some cowardly letters, such as he had received before, but he would treat the writers as he had treated the individual whom he had ejected.'

This needs no comment. We, of course, are free from such mercenary ways. But hold!—what of those churches among us who gauge their pastor's success by the financial balance-sheet, and forsake or get rid of him when that is not satisfactory? Is not that a selling of the pastorate to the highest bidder? There is—yes, there is—a simony of the pew—as well as a simony of the pulpit. Christian workers, *put it down!*

THE *Canada Presbyterian* for August 2nd has the following paragraph:

"Why should our neighbours of the Congregational Union encourage schism by trying to establish Congregational Churches in localities in which trouble may have arisen in Presbyterian congregations? We have in our mind's eye three recent instances in which this body have laid the foundation of a Congregational Church on a Presbyterian quarrel. Do our neighbours suppose that the glory of God is promoted in this way? Do they imagine that even Congregationalism is advanced by such procedure? Is the dirty linen of Presbyterianism a sufficient foundation on which to plant a Congregational Church? Is the cause of truth and righteousness promoted by opening a little cave of Adullam beside other congregations into which all the sore-heads, refugees from discipline, troublers of Israel and general 'cranks' may be gathered? A little straightforward talk on these points might be a far more wholesome thing for both bodies than the 'dear brother' gush that we have from delegates at our ecclesiastical meetings. Brotherly love that has not honour and fair dealing for a basis is a poor thing."

We cannot compliment the writer on his knowledge of Congregationalism. We fancy that our readers will smile when they are told that the Congregational Union is "trying to establish Congregational Churches" in any locality. That body has just about as much to do with such action as—well, Arabi Pasha. Some parties have, in different localities, for reasons which they thought good and sufficient, left the Presbyterian Church and organized themselves into Congregational Churches—a step, we venture to think, they had a right to take—and *after* their organization admission was sought and obtained into the

Congregational Union—a very different thing indeed to being organized by the Union.

But there is one other side to this question. Why do we hear from the *Canada Presbyterian* for the first time about the naughtiness of these things? Has that paper, Presbyteries, Synods or General Assembly, protested against Congregationalists leaving their own body because of "troubles," and becoming Presbyterians? If such protest or warning has been given, we have failed to notice it. Is it too much to say—we think not—that there are Presbyterian Churches which would not have been alive to-day but for recruits from Congregationalism? In Toronto itself more than one Presbyterian Church owes a good deal to Congregational secessions because of troubles; and as for ministers, "we have in our mind's eye" one remarkable instance where a minister was received from our body, very dirty linen and all, without an inquiry, and with open arms, by a Presbytery. Let our brother begin at home; when he has spoken courageously on this subject there, we shall be prepared to listen to him, at any rate respectfully.

FAITH'S ROLL CALL.—IX.

RAHAB.

The name Rahab, or more correctly Rachab (for Rahab, Egypt, Ps. lxxxvii. 4; lxxxix. 10; Is. li. 9, is not the same Hebrew name), is found only, in the Old Testament, in Joshua ii. 1-3; vi. 17, 23, 25, where reference is had to the one individual by that name known. The name appears in the New Testament, Matt. i. 5; Heb. xi. 31; James ii. 25. With regard to the passage in Hebrews and that in James there can be no difficulty; they refer undoubtedly to the same person as the verses in Joshua—indeed they expressly declare the reference. With regard to the genealogy of our Lord in Matthew, some doubt may arise as to the identity, seeing the Hebrew records of the Old Testament are silent thereon—*e.g.*, Ruth iv. 20, 21; and yet no other individual having that name seems known either in tradition or history. The insertion of a female name in the genealogy would seem to indicate one known, as in the other cases in this same genealogy, and Rahab the harlot was known, the Talmud traditions reckoning eight prophets as among her descendants, among whom are Jeremiah and Baruch. The chronology,