

## Our Contributors.

### SOME REMAINING MEMBERS OF THE JEHU FAMILY.

BY KNOXONIAN.

The *Globe* quotes our paragraph on the Scott Act Jehu and uses it as a peg on which to hang a homily. The homily has some good qualities. It is short, which is more than can be said of many homilies. It is perfectly intelligible—a quality which all homilies have not. The subject of the homily is the sin of “generalization on very inadequate data.” The weak point about the homily is that it has no connection with our paragraph. The paragraph might have the small-pox, and the homily is so far away from it that, though unvaccinated, it would be in no danger of taking the disease. But here is the homily:

There are, no doubt, such Scott Act Jehus who attach an undue importance to Prohibition, and who possibly fancy that if they but hold by that they may take considerable liberties with the whole of the Decalogue. Their number, however, must be very small compared with that of the level-headed, God-fearing and judicious upholders of the Scott Act. Generalization on very inadequate data is by some carried to the length of an absolute craze. One fact is with such a sufficient justification for the foundation of a general law. One solitary individual is made the type of a class.

The link between this homily and our paragraph is as hard to find as Darwin's missing link. We said not a single word about the number of the Scott Act Jehus. We said nothing about the numerical proportion they bear to the “level-headed, God-fearing and judicious upholders of the Scott Act.” We did not generalize. We did not make one fact the foundation of a general law. We never made one solitary individual the type of a class. If our big contemporary had any experience in the actual work of carrying the Scott Act it would know that one Jehu such as we described can do more harm at a critical moment in the contest than ten “level-headed, God-fearing and judicious” men may be able to counteract. In contests of every kind, from the days of Martin Luther downwards, causes have suffered quite as much from the foolishness of their friends as from the opposition of their foes. Has the Liberal party of Ontario never lost an election through the foolishness or noise of one or two Liberal Jehus? Has the party never choked off a friendly oratorical Jehu who was doing more harm than good on the stump? We could give one or two instances of that kind of procedure ourselves, and we don't know half as much about politics as the *Globe* knows. A few weeks ago it was feared that some of the young Liberal Jehus might drive too furiously in their convention and some of the level-headed undertook to regulate the driving. It was a wise thing to do. It would be a strange thing indeed were there not Scott Act Jehus at the present time. There may not be very many but one in a polling division is one too many. But we must sketch

#### THE EVANGELISTIC JEHU.

When the evangelistic Jehu enters a community he does not drive very furiously at first. He makes his pace easy so that the Jehonadabs may enter his chariot if they will. If his meetings are well attended, and make a temporary excitement in the community, he always increases his pace and tries to drive rough-shod over the Jehonadabs who decline to ride behind him. He shouts very loudly: “Come, see my zeal!” He shouts that several times at every meeting. He declares that the churches and ministers all belong to the house of Ahab. He attacks the hireling clergy. He says he preaches for nothing, and may be supposed to know the exact value of his services. Though he professes to be too pious to take a fixed salary he is always willing to take any amount of money if you call it a present and say it comes from the Lord. He does not care to take the filthy lucre in an open, manly way. He likes you to slip it quietly into his hand. This style of Jehu never visits a back township. He does not like corduroy roads. He dislikes sleeping in a shanty. A pork and green tea diet has no charms for him. He leaves work in the back townships to the hireling clergy. Nothing pleases him so much as to settle down in a rich man's house. When he begins work in a community he always declares that he has no intention of forming a congregation of any kind; but he generally does not go very far until he does all in his power to form one. The means he uses to form a society are often most disreputable. His ministry, begun in the spirit, as he says, sometimes ends in the

flesh. Now, lest somebody should say that we generalize from inadequate data, found a general law on one fact, or make a solitary individual the type of a class, we hasten to add that all evangelists are not Jehus. We are writing about the Jehu class and that class only.

Let it not be supposed that the Jehus all belong to ecclesiastical or religious circles. They are found in the political arena. There, for example, is

#### THE RADICAL JEHU.

The most prominent characteristic of the Radical Jehu is his inbred hatred of authority of all kinds. He wishes to pull down everybody. He would rather see his country wrecked than see anybody in office except that body happened to be himself. He professes to have great confidence in the people; but he would not trust a poor man with a pound of tea any more readily than would the most hide-bound Tory. He professes to have great love for the people; but he often treats those in his power with a vulgar tyranny that would make any decent man ashamed. The Radical Jehu believes that the way to save a country is to put all the people on a dead level, socially, financially and every other way. When they are reduced to a dead level then he will reign over them if he can. And the worst tyrant this world ever sees is a Radical Jehu armed with power. But, lest some Grit journal should say we generalize from inadequate data, found a general law on one fact or make one solitary individual the type of a class, we must add that all Radicals are not Jehus. Far from it. This contributor would walk farther to see and hear John Bright than to see and hear any living statesman. John Bright is perhaps the noblest statesman this century has produced. A pinchbeck imitator of John Bright is very likely to be one of the meanest.

Alongside of the Radical Jehu let us put his antipodes,

#### THE TORY JEHU.

Lip-loyalty is the *forte* of the Tory Jehu. He professes to be willing to fight or die not only for his sovereign but for his sovereign's man-servant, maid-servant, ox, or ass. When it comes to real fighting he is not any nearer the front than his neighbours. Sometimes he prefers sending his wife's able-bodied relations to the front. The genuine Tory Jehu is profoundly impressed with the idea that the best use a Radical can be put to is to hang him. The only other useful purpose that he thinks a Radical can be used for is to pay taxes. Hanging and paying taxes are the purposes for which he thinks Nature intended Radicals. The Tory Jehu likes office. In fact he thinks that he and his class were sent into this world to fill all good-paying offices. There is just one point on which the Tory Jehu and Radical Jehu always agree. The one point is that a good office is a good thing to have. The most bitter, blatant, howling Radical Jehu can usually be mollified by a good office. The Tory Jehu thinks he was born to fill a good office and should have it as a matter of right. The Radical Jehu shouts and drives furiously and hopes to get it as a matter of fight. But, lest some Tory journal should say that we generalize from inadequate data, found a general law on one fact, or make one solitary individual the type of a class, we conclude by saying that all Tories are not Jehus.

### THE REFORMATION JUBILEE IN GENEVA.

CELEBRATED FROM 20TH TO 23RD AUGUST, 1885.

Some readers seeing this heading will ask themselves what there was in an event which took place three centuries and a-half ago, in a small town on the shore of Lake Lemman, to make the story of it worth telling now, especially in a land more than 3,000 miles away, and will turn the page in quest of a topic of present interest, and more attractive appearance. This is natural enough. Indeed, a pastor of the Swiss National Church wrote me at the time that the Jubilee even in Geneva, was rather a thing “made” than the spontaneous outcome of the national conscience of the present day—that such Protestant Jubilees in Switzerland are past—they are the Alpenglüthen without a tomorrow. Explanatory of this it must be remembered that the Geneva of 1885 is very different from that of 1535—the majority of the population being no longer Protestant—still the general spirit of the *fete* was good, and the religious, political and social benefits of the Reformation were ably handled by prominent

pastors before large congregations, many persons, perhaps, having for the first time heard that Geneva owes its historical fame and its prestige abroad entirely to the Reformation, without which it would still have remained but a small town of fairs and inns, like so many other Swiss towns.

Those who take the trouble to read through the following imperfect outline of the Reformation at Geneva and its consequences will find at least two facts, which, in my opinion, make that event worthy of the attentive study of Presbyterians, at all events, not merely in Switzerland, but in all lands. These, briefly stated, are: (1) It was in Geneva that Presbyterianism was first crystallized into a special form of church government by John Calvin; and (2) Geneva thereafter became the bulwark of Protestantism—the “City of Refuge” for the persecuted for conscience' sake of all lands, and remained such up to the issuing of the Edict of Toleration by Louis XVI. of France in 1787.

Let us now, in the first place, see under what circumstances this important event of the sixteenth century took place, and what was the condition of Geneva when it began to play an important role on the Continent of Europe. At the era of the Reformation, Geneva was a

#### SMALL EPISCOPAL TOWN

governed by a bishop having the prerogatives of a sovereign. Its citizens who joined in advancing the new era dawning on the world were moved only by patriotism, while in reality they were unconscious instruments in the divine hand, working out great and glorious ends. Think of the position at that time of this little republic. The Duke of Savoy—the enemy of all liberty—owned the lands which surrounded the town on both sides; not merely Savoy proper, but the country of Gex, and what is now the Canton of Vaud, so that, as an old chronicler says, the bells of St. Pierre (the cathedral of Geneva) were heard by more Savoyards than Genevese. No wonder, then, the owner of the ducal throne coveted the possession also of the independent little town in the heart of his dominions. To gain it over he had recourse to all sorts of stratagems. At one time he expected much from the prelatric rulers who were often his own relatives, but he found them too careful of their own privileges “to permit him to put his muzzle into their soup.” At another time, he tried his own personal influence, for being owner of the chateau on an isle in the Rhone, which flows through the town, he used often to make prolonged visits giving *fetes* and granting favours to prominent citizens whom he hoped to gain over to his side. At last he appealed to their own self-interest, promising Geneva the restoration of its fairs, which had attracted to the town many strangers and had given a great impulse to commerce, but which had been ruined in favour of those of Lyons by prohibitive measures adopted by Duke Louis IX. and Louis XI., King of France. In return for this the Duke asked the Syndic for his oath of allegiance in the name of the city. To this insidious proposition the Syndic replied that “precious liberty was preferable to all things; and that he had rather live in poverty crowned with liberty, than become rich and live in slavery, paying annual tribute.” Being an episcopal town, Geneva had within its walls

#### AN IMMENSE NUMBER OF PRIESTS,

there being some 700 monks whose only duty it was to say mass. The presence of so many idle men necessarily caused demoralization. They disguised themselves as soldiers, frequented taverns, quarrelled, celebrated clandestine marriages, exacted exorbitant taxes, and as one of the bishops says: “They lived in the world without seriousness or temperance, addicted to all the licentiousness of the age, and, shameful thing to say, they led lives more execrable than those of their flocks.” These scandals of the clergy, together with the superstitions practised for the purpose of making money, prepared the way for the Reformation, rumours of which were arriving from all sides. In June, 1532, came to Geneva

#### LAMBERT, A FRANCISCAN MONK

of rare eloquence, a native of Avignon, who had read some of the writings of Luther, and who, after a long struggle of conscience, was converted to the Gospel. He had not yet broken entirely with Rome, but he preached for a week in the churches of the city, his reputation attracting immense crowds. He remained, however, but a short time on the shore of Lake Le-